DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 644 PS 003 800

AUTHOR	Handler, Ellen Oppenheimer
TITLE	Preschools and Their Graduates.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Sociology.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	213p.; Submitted in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology in the Graduate Coll. of the Univ. of Illinois, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.00 HC-$10.75
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Classroom Observation Techniques, *Disadvantaged Youth, Preschool Children, *Preschool Programs, Program Effectiveness, *Program Length, School Organization, *Socialization, *Socioeconomic Status, Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study clarifies the goals and functions of long day and short day preschools, as related to the requirements of the client groups being served, and analyzes their effects on children's socialization and elementary school achievement. It was hypothesized that low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day preschools would be more likely to meet the normative expectations of the primary school than low socioeconomic status children who had attended short day preschools. High socioeconomic status children who had attended long day preschools were expected to do about equally well as those who had attended short day preschools or no preschools at all. Data were obtained from classroom observations and interviews with 21 teachers in six nursery schools and day care centers. School records of 584 second grade students were analyzed. The measures of school achievement used were: (1) ability to achieve normal promotion, (2) the absence of teacher comments indicating unacceptable classroom behavior, and (3) scores on two objective achievement tests, scored by an outside agency. The central hypotheses were largely supported by the findings. (Author/NH)

ED041644

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PRESCHOOLS AND THEIR GRADUATES

BY

ELLEN OPPENHEIMER HANDLER

A.B., Vassar College, 1951
A.M., University of Chicago, 1953

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970

Urbana, Illinois

PS003800

PRESCHOOLS AND THEIR GRADUATES

Ellen Oppenheimer Handler, Ph.D
Department of Sociology
University of Illinois, 1970

The purpose of this study was to establish connections between the structure of socialization settings, socialization process, and socialization outcomes. The first year was devoted to observations and interviews with staff at a variety of preschools. It was found that length of the school day and socioeconomic status of the client group were major foci for differentiating among preschools. These two factors were used in combination to define four theoretical types which could in turn be related to existing preschool instructions. Long day preschools for low socioeconomic status children correspond to subsidized day care centers. Short day preschools for low socioeconomic status children can be represented by Head Start programs. Long day preschools for high socioeconomic status children corresponds to private day care centers and short day preschools for high socioeconomic status children are represented by private nursery schools.

Two types of evidence were presented to show the usefulness of the typology. Data from the observational study were used to show that children who attended different types of preschools learned different kinds of school related skills. Thus, we attempted to show that the socialization process was different in the various types of preschools. Second, the usefulness of the typology was demonstrated by presenting data on school achievement of children who had attended different types of preschool institutions. A total of 584 second

graders were classified into six groups on the basis of preschool attendance or non-attendance. The children's school achievement was evaluated by using three types of measures, selected to correspond to different types of school related skills.

According to the central hypothesis of the study it was expected that among low socioeconomic status children, those who had attended long day preschools would show a higher level of school achievement than those who had attended short day schools. Among high socioeconomic status children, it was predicted that preschool attendance would not greatly affect school achievement. The results offer strong support for the hypothesis. On all three measures of school achievement low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day schools did better than those who had attended short day schools. Among high socioeconomic status children differences in school achievement by preschool attendance were minor and should probably be attributed to differences in demographic characteristics of the three high socioeconomic status groups of children.

Thus, the second type of evidence showed that the typology was useful for predicting socialization outcomes as well. In summary, this study showed that two factors relating to the structure of socialization settings were useful to differentiate preschools in terms of socialization process and helped to predict the effectiveness of preschool education in terms of socialization outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A great many different people have helped to bring about this study but only a few can be mentioned here. First, I would like to thank the Danforth Foundation, not only for providing financial support but also for providing an in-group of female fellows who shared similar problems and could offer moral support and many practical suggestions.

Second, I should like to thank my dissertation committee, and especially my advisor, Professor Bernard Farber, for their guidance and suggestions at various stages of the study. Also, Professor Katz of the Department of Early Childhood Education deserves special thanks for her helpful comments and criticisms.

I wish I could thank personally all the various people who cooperated in this study, the teachers in the preschools I visited, the staff of the licensing agency, and particularly the officials of the school system where we gathered data on the children's performance. For reasons of confidentiality, I cannot identify them further but I owe them much thanks for all their help.

Above all, I would like to thank my family, my husband, Paul Handler, and my three children, Ira, Harry and Lilly. In more ways than they know, they have helped me when I needed help and they forgave my many failings as housewife and mother during the course of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

I THE SUBJECT. 1

Practical Rationale. 2
Theoretical Rationale. 7

II METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW. 13

The Observational Study. 14
The Statistical Study. 19

III THE DIMENSIONS DEFINED 25

Length of Day. 27
Socioeconomic Status of the Client Group 41

IV THE DIMENSIONS APPLIED 52

The Constants. 52
Implications of Length of Day. 57
Implications of Client Socioeconomic Status. 75

V THE TYPOLOGY 87

Review of the Literature 88
School Related Skills. 94
Educational Contributions of Types of Preschools . . . 100
The Central Hypothesis 112

VI DATA COLLECTION. 115

Research Design. 116
The Sample 128
Measures of School Achievement 139

VII RESULTS. 146

Promotion Pattern. 146
Relation of Promotion Pattern to Demographic Characteristics. 150

CHAPTER Page

VIII SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 171

Summary of Findings. 171
Implications of the Findings 178
Suggestions for Further Investigations 180

REFERENCES 184

APPENDIX

A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRESCHOOL TEACHERS 191
B. SHORT FORM DESIGNED FOR DATA COLLECTION. 200
C. ADDITIONAL TABLES. 201

VITA 204

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		Page
1	COMMITMENT TO PRESCHOOL TEACHING BY WORK SETTING	73
2	EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY WORK SETTING	73
3	SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVENESS.	130
4	DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF HEAD START CHILDREN BY LENGTH OF TIME ATTENDED	136
5	DISTRIBUTION OF PRESCHOOL GROUPS BY SCHOOLS.	138
6	PROMOTION PATTERN BY PRESCHOOL GROUP	148
7	RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS BY PRESCHOOL GROUP.	151
8	FAMILY STRUCTURE AND NUMBER OF SIBLINGS BY PRESCHOOL GROUP.	152
9a	OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF PARENTS BY PRESCHOOL GROUP. . . .	153
9b	OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MOTHER BY PRESCHOOL GROUP	154
10	WITHIN GROUPS I AND II OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MOTHER BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED).	157
11	WITHIN GROUPS I AND II NUMBER OF SIBLINGS BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)	157
12	OBJECTIVE TEST SCORES BY PRESCHOOL GROUP	161
13	TEACHERS' MENTION OF CLASSROOM PROBLEM(S) BY PRESCHOOL GROUP.	167
14	WITHIN GROUPS I AND II FAMILY STRUCTURE BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)	201
15	WITHIN GROUPS I AND II OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF FATHER BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED).	202
16	WITHIN GROUPS I AND II SEX AND RACE BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)	203

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Types of Preschool Institutions.	87
2	Summary of Skills Learned in Different Types of Preschools.	111
3	The Comparison Groups.	134

CHAPTER I

THE SUBJECT

Preschools, defined as institutions for the group care and/or education of children from about two to five years of age, have been operating in America at least since the beginning of the nineteenth century. However, until the 1960's, their educational importance was not widely recognized or fostered. With rare exceptions, these institutions were regarded as primarily custodial. In the classical studies on education such as that by Waller (1965; original edition, 1932), a child's education was thought to begin when he entered the elementary school.

A fundamental redefinition occurred with the establishment of Head Start programs, which were designed explicitly to serve the educational needs of "disadvantaged" sectors of the child population. The various studies on the results of Head Start programs have underscored the connection between preschool and primary school education by evaluating the success of preschool programs in terms of the performance of their graduates in elementary schools. This study will follow a similar pattern in that respect. However, it will differ from previous studies first, because it is concerned with a number of different types of preschool programs, only one of which is Head Start. Second, the study will differentiate preschool types not by program content, as is usually the case, but by length of school day and socioeconomic status of client group. The purpose of this study will be to trace the effect of these factors on socialization process and outcome.

This study has both a practical and a theoretical rationale. This introduction will focus on each in turn.

Practical Rationale

The American people, with educators in the forefront, have become increasingly concerned with school failures. The irony of the situation is that the concern has shown an inverse relationship with the extent of school failures. The proportion of school age children who have completed high school has steadily risen and the illiterate proportion of the population has steadily fallen (Folger, 1967). The concern can be traced rather to an increasing understanding of the importance of the educational system for the maintenance of an open class structure. The American public school has two major functions. First, it must socialize the young to fulfill general societal demands. Second, and later, it must stratify students on the basis of ability to steer them into channels appropriate for their future careers (Parsons, 1959). School failures are literally those on whom the schools have failed to perform this function. This socialization failure can be due either to lack of educational input or to resistance to socialization on the part of those undergoing socialization or to some combination of these two factors. These factors result in the formation and continuation of deviant subcultures. As Farber (1968) has pointed out, these deviant subcultures are functional as well as dysfunctional and will probably remain a feature of the larger social structure. However, the general public is usually aware only of the dysfunctional consequences, mainly in the form of crime and welfare costs. These costs cannot be eliminated as the experience of Russia and other "welfare" states so eloquently testifies. Nevertheless, it is well known that the criminal and welfare population generally have a history of poor scholastic performance and it is understandable that many people believe that improving the educational input will reduce the magnitude of these social costs.

The crux of the matter may be that the subgroups that represent relatively the most serious net social costs are those that are forced to remain outsiders because they are unable to become members of the dominant majority. The hippies, for example, may be considered a deviant subgroup by choice. They are generally not criminal nor on the welfare rolls and many were very successful scholastically before they decided to "drop out" of the middle class way of life. The criminal and welfare population, on the other hand, may have been relegated to deviant status partly because they lacked an acceptable opportunity structure. Thus, education serves as a primary avenue of social mobility, which Sorokin (1927) saw as essential to the preservation of an open class structure.

The problem of school failure has been accentuated by our growing demands on the educational system. Not only do we expect the schools to succeed with all who enter but we also expect the graduates to have mastered quantitatively more material than they did in the past. Since the advent of Sputnik, there has been a constant upgrading of educational content, especially at the elementary and high school level. One of the results of this adding of new educational content has been a pushing downward of old educational content. When Waller (1932) described the elementary school in the 1920's and 1930's, school started in first grade, but at least the first year, and to some extent the first three years, were devoted largely to socializing the child into the student role. When kindergarten was added to the public school system, it became the locus of "bootcamp" training (Gracey, 1967). Today, many kindergarten teachers complain that they can bring across to the children all the required educational content only if the children have already been "civilized" elsewhere.*

The logical result of these pressures was the "discovery" of the preschool as an educational institution that would prepare children for the tacit admissions requirements of the elementary school. Until very recently, preschools had reached only a minute fraction of two to five year old children. Preschools were usually regarded either as custodial institutions for children of the poor, to permit their mothers to work, or as play schools for children whose families could afford such luxuries. This conception of preschools changed with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964. This legislation provided federal funds for new programs which were designed to give an educational Head Start to those most likely to fail in elementary school, i.e. the poor. By then it had become abundantly clear that this group of children were not adequately prepared by their homes to ensure them equality of opportunity with middle class children when they entered school.

From the beginning, these programs suffered from unrealistic expectations. First, it was hoped that the education-related deficiencies of economically deprived children could be wiped out in a single, eight week summer session. In addition, these programs were expected to bring, simultaneously, benefits of many different kinds, not just to the children but to their families as well. Head Start was to remedy nutritional, medical, dental, and emotional as well as academic deficiencies of the children. Furthermore, the programs were expected to put money into the pockets of the needy by employing indigenous poor to run the programs. Head Start was expected to provide educational programs for the parents as well as for the children.

---

*Information taken from interviews with kindergarten teachers.

Very quickly, it became apparent that eight weeks of summer Head Start were not sufficient to carry out this mandate. Accordingly, year round programs were instituted and have been expanded. However, today there is growing evidence that even these cannot fulfill the requirements. Even an optimistic reading of the comprehensive Westinghouse Report on the results of Head Start programs (Cicarelli, 1969) shows that the results are not spectacularly successful.

There have been several types of reactions to the disappointing results. Some have argued cogently that Head Start has never really been given a chance to prove itself (Hunt, 1970). Besides the theoretical explanations for the findings, it is also possible that the current programs are not a true measure of its potential because of the chronic, incidental problems in funding, administration, etc. that have plagued these programs from their inception (C~~e~~anter, 1968).

A second reaction has been a form of defeatism. With Jensen's findings (1969) on the relationship between race and intelligence, it has been argued that equality of opportunity may be an unreasonable

PS 003800

goal if low achievement is due largely to genetic factors. It should be noted that this point of view must be labeled "jensenism" because it is a vulgarized and greatly over similified version of a complex subject.

A third response has been to search for new ways to achieve this goal. A number of reseachers have been designing new programs which may be more congruent with the specific deficiencies of underprivileged children. The current study is part of this general effort. However, it differs markedly in its approach. Whereas the main input variable in such studies has been differences in program content, this study focuses on structural factors relating to the organization that supplies the service.

Before going further, it is important to make two points. Many persons today are very dissatisfied with the elementary school system (Sexton, 1961; Reissman, 1954). They point to the need for reform in a number of crucial respects. Clearly, there is much merit in their argument. However, from the point of view of this research, if we assume that the major problem lies in the goals and techniques of elementary schools, then there is little value in attempting to devise programs to help children to attain "success" in school. The whole purpose of compensatory education is to help the children to fit into the school system as it now operates. Thus, in order to deal with the concerns of this report the researcher must define his stance towards the elementary school. In this case, the author will accept the elementary school as it exists today as a given. The reason is not that the schools are necessarily adequate but that reform will probably come very gradually. In the meantime, the children will continue to be faced with the problem of adapting to a social system which they cannot escape. Accordingly, it is important to consider what types of programs will fulfill this function. Therefore, the problem in this study is the relationship between the preschool and elementary school programs, regardless of the intrinsic value of one or the other. Second, this study makes no claim that success or failure as a student is related to the child's success or failure in his other roles. As Bidwell (1962) points out, status socialization includes socialization for many roles. A child's scholastic success may not be predictive of success in his family or neighborhood role. This study will attempt to contribute to the solution of some of these problems by showing how different kinds of preschools vary in their effectiveness in teaching school related skills. The effectiveness of preschools will be shown to depend on the length of the school day and on the capabilities and deficiencies of the client group.

Theoretical Rationale

At a more abstract level, this study will attempt to show how selected organizational variables relating to a type of socializing agency affect the outcome of the socialization process. As such, it deals with some of the concerns expressed by Stanton Wheeler in his theoretical essay on "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings" (1969). Thus, it relates two areas of sociological enquiry, that of socialization and that of organizational analysis. It is hoped that some of the ideas developed in this investigation may be applicable to other types of organizations and other types of processes as well.

Following Brim (1969), socialization can be defined as a life long process whereby individuals are given knowledge about role behaviors, skill in their execution, and the motivation to perform the roles associated with their various statuses. Socialization is carried out by virtually every major social institution in society, the work place, the family, the church, and so on. Increasingly, however, socialization is carried out by formal organizations, which can be defined as social systems that are oriented to the attainment of one or more specific goals (Parsons, 1964). Socialization agencies are a subgroup of formal organizations whose primary goal has to do with socialization. Much socialization occurs in a factory but the primary goal of a factory is not to socialize its members. Schools, however, are members of that class of formal organizations known as socialization agencies. Prisons, in many instances, are another.

As Wheeler (1969) points out, very little is known about the effects of organizational factors on the outcome of socialization. There are many conjectures but no facts. One reason may be that this type of problem is exceptionally difficult to study. First, organizational analysis is in itself complex because of the variety and interaction of relevant variables in each structure. The researcher is forced to choose between two almost equally unsatisfying strategies. Either he can study a very small sample of organizations rather thoroughly or he can study a more adequate sample of organizations very superficially. Neither approach gives him a firm basis for generalization. Then, if he wants to study the effects in terms of the outcome of the socialization process, he is forced to carry out a longitudinal study concerning the objectives of socialization in addition.

One of the basic problems is that socialization always has a present and a future component. The relationship between the two components is highly variable. In a factory in-service training program the emphasis is on present role behaviors. The objective is to train recruits to perform satisfactorily in their current setting. To make the training relevant for future role behaviors is incidental to the aim of the program. It may even be in conflict with the primary aim. Workers who have training that equips them for better paying jobs may be more likely to leave. If a worker leaves shortly after he has completed his in-service training, the program has been dysfunctional to the primary goal of the factory.

In contrast to the factory, formal organizations whose primary goal is that of socialization are characterized by a strong emphasis on future role behaviors. The proof of the effectiveness of such socialization processes lies in the ability of the recruit to perform well elsewhere. The model prisoner who gets into trouble soon after his release is not counted a success. The perpetual student is not regarded favorably by those who evaluate educational institutions even though he may function admirably as a student.

However, because of the difficulties in studying the relevant future effects of socialization, many studies have focused on socialization for present role behaviors. Such studies present serious problems in interpretation since it would be unwarranted to extrapolate from success in teaching present oriented role behaviors to success in teaching future oriented role behaviors. Goffman's studies of the socialization of mental hospital patients (1961) show that adaptation to the demands of the institution can be dysfunctional for the patient's recovery and eventual return to the world outside. On a more theoretical level, Selznick (1957) has shown the problems involved in reconciling strategies appropriate for organizational maintenance with those appropriate for meeting the organization's formal goals. In the school situation, a child's model deportment today, which may be very helpful for the smooth functioning of the school, may be unrelated to his success at a higher level of education or in other facets of society.

The relationship between specific organizational factors and the outcome of socialization is, as yet, relatively uncharted. However, at a practical level, it is generally believed that knowledge of the organization that socialized a given individual is helpful for predicting the individual's future success. Some college admissions officers believe that graduates from some high schools, on the average, do much better than graduates from other schools. Some argue that even a poorer student from a better institution is more likely to do well in the future than a better student from a poorer institution. There is less agreement on exactly what constitutes a good school. Innumerable organizational factors have been investigated, ranging from simple factors such as size, or staff-client ratios to complex constructs such as social climate, and level of bureaucratization. In the current study the main organizational factor to be investigated is the length of the school day, which would seem to place it at the simple end of the continuum.

However, the connection between specific organizational factors and the outcome of socialization is even more complex than the foregoing would suggest because organizational factors are difficult to isolate. It may be true that the candidate from an elite school is more likely to be successful than a candidate from a non-accredited school but how much of the difference can be explained by prior characteristics of their clientele. Perhaps the elite school only accepts elite students. A factory in-service training program that accepts only candidates with a history of steady employment has a far better prognosis than one that seeks to train the hard-core unemployed. The former group have already acquired the social skills associated with working, e.g. punctuality, deference to superiors, how to make a presentable appearance, etc., which the latter have not.

Therefore in a study of the relationship of organizational factors and socialization outcome it is important to take into account the characteristics of the persons who are processed by the socializing agency. Such variables can be studied at the level of the individual or of the group. In the latter case, it is assumed that organizations that differ in structural factors attract clients who consistently differ in respects that are related to the outcome of socialization. The characteristics of the client group can also be studied as an independent organizational variable by calling it the recruitment process. This study will treat client characteristics as an attribute of the organization by focusing attention on who actually is recruited, not on whom the organization is trying to attract.

In summary, this study of the effectiveness of preschool education deals with the interaction of two organizational factors, the length of the preschool day and the socioeconomic status of the client group. Together, they will be used to predict the relative success of their graduates in the elementary school. Chapter III will be devoted to a discussion of the importance of these factors in the context of preschool education.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

This study represents an exploratory analysis of a complex subject. The results should not be considered a basis for generalization but as a signal that this general direction might lead to important insights in the future. This study was divided into two major parts. The first was an observational study of six preschool institutions. This consisted of systematic observations in all classes of these schools and lengthy interviews with all the teachers to obtain insight into differences in socialization process. On the basis of this data, a typology of preschool institutions was developed using two foci of differentiation, length of preschool day and socioeconomic status of client group. The two factors were used to frame some hypotheses about the relationship between structural factors concerning the preschool institutions and socialization outcomes in terms of the children's elementary school performance.

The second part of the study constituted a statistical test of the central hypotheses. Its purpose was to compare school achievement of elementary school children who had attended different types of preschools. The data was taken from the children's school records. The second part of the study took place in a different community than the first and thus involved different preschools and different children than the observational study. This chapter will describe the two parts of the study in turn.

The Observational Study

The first year of this study was devoted to intensive observations and interviews at six preschool institutions. The approach to the problem was inductive, through observation of a wide spectrum of facets of preschool institutions because existing data was not adequate for choosing or building a theoretical framework. The basic strategy was the method of constant comparison, which was described and demonstrated in the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967). The purpose of this early phase was to develop a typology of preschool institutions, which is essentially a set of primitive, implicit hypotheses about the primary foci for differentiation. Such typologies, in turn, become useful for developing more refined hypotheses, which lead to greater insight. The value of a typology depends on its potential for stimulating this continuing process. Bidwell (1965), in his analysis of the shortcomings of the sociology of education urged the development of typologies as an aid to the research effort. This study represents one such effort.

The preschool institutions at which the study was begun were chosen to achieve a wide range of types in terms of size, quality of program, major goal(s) of program, and characteristics of clientele and staff. The schools also differed in their sponsorship and source of support. They included private commercial, private charitable, private non-profit, poverty program, and church sponsored types of organizations. They were selected in consultation with university professors who were well informed about varieties in preschool institutions and with the help of the staff of the local licensing agency, who investigate such institutions and are also well informed about their characteristics. Only one of the schools contacted asked not to be included in the study. The reason given was that they were already suffering from a superfluity of observers. In all those that were visited, cooperation was excellent.

As is usual in the study of organizations, a multiple approach was used (Scott, 1965). Classroom observations and interviews with the teachers were the core methods. It was found that these methods were complementary and especially effective when the interviews followed the observations. The observations permitted the researcher to gain a great deal of information about the school and about the interaction pattern in the classroom. Through informal conversations during the period of observations, the researcher could ask for explanations of what was being observed. The process also served to establish rapport between the researcher and the teacher so that subsequent interviews became immediately productive. It was possible to omit the initial stage of developing trust, which is characteristic of interviews without prologue. The interviews were long and open ended. They were standardized to some extent by coverage of the questions shown in the questionnaire in Appendix A. The purpose was to gain information about the teacher and about the organization in which she worked. Whenever possible, an attempt was made to elicit details and critical incidents as well as teachers' reactions. Also, during the interviews it was possible to bring up discrepant observational materials and to resolve apparent anomalies. All teachers (N = 21) in the six schools were observed and interviewed. Because tape recordings were not used, the material was transcribed from memory immediately following the observations and interviews.

In the six schools all classes were observed for several long periods of time (2-3 hours). children were observed in different situations to determine the constants in behavior patterns across situations. Whenever possible, the children were observed with different teachers and the teachers with different children. This pointed up constants in the teachers' approach to the children and in the children's dealings with teachers. The teacher-child interactions were observed at functionally different times of the day, e.g. meal times, rest times, free times, as well as during formal teaching periods. In nursery schools it was possible to stay through a whole morning or afternoon sessions. In day care centers, visits were scheduled to coincide with different types of activities. By making repeated observations of the same children and teachers, it was possible to gain some notion of the variation that might be attributed to observer presence the first time. The children did not seem to be affected but the teachers were somewhat strained and more formal until they became convinced that the researcher had not come to pass judgment on the quality of their work.

By systematically varying the observations by time of day, personality and training of teachers, age of children, type of activity, etc., it was possible to some extent to separate the underlying regularities from idiosyncratic variations. This method is a crude translation of test-retest reliability estimation. Naturally, this method alone cannot adequately establish the reliability of the observations. Since there was only a single observer, there was no opportunity to determine inter-judge reliability. However, even if there had been multiple observers, it is questionable whether they would have noted exactly the same phenomena in the multiplicity of impressions that were constantly at hand. Whenever possible, the observer tried to include objective data, i.e. time schedules, number of activities carried on simultaneously, number of times a given activity was repeated, number of children present and proportion of total enrollment, sex-race distribution of children, etc. However, since the purpose of the observations was to gain as full an understanding of the socialization process as possible, such fragmentary objective data could provide only very incomplete information.

As researchers such as Becker (1958 and 1957) and Strauss (1964) have pointed out, observational methods can be particularly appropriate for gathering sociological data. This is especially the case when the object of study is one or more organizations and when the researcher does not know enough about his subject a priori to identify the relevant problems and hypotheses. However, such methods present thorny problems of establishing bases for inference or proof according to the standards of science.

The validity of the data were even more difficult to assess. In this case, two methods were attempted, neither of which provides a very satisfactory solution to the problem. The first method was to compare interview with observational data whenever possible, since there was some overlap in information obtained from the two sources. For instance, teachers described in the interview how they handled certain types of children and situations. They were also observed carrying out such activities. The second method was employed mainly after enough information had been collected to distinguish some underlying patterns. The resultant tentative insights were discussed with various experts in the field of preschool education, e.g. professors, experienced former preschool teachers and staff of the state licensing agency, etc. This proved to be very helpful for the study. These experts could distinguish which types of findings might be atypical because of local factors and which had wider applicability. Only those factors which seemed generally useful were included in this study. Further, these experts helped to interpret the findings, which, in turn helped to guide the research process into areas that seemed particularly useful.

This study of the six institutions became the basis for defining the differentiating dimensions which determined the typology. At first, the theoretical skeleton was tentatively set out because it was not known whether the framework would have relevance beyond the six organizations on which it was based. Accordingly, the next step was to study another six preschool institutions to determine whether selected hypotheses, derived from the dimensions, were supported by further study. Also, in this part of the study, new sources of data were used. For instance, documents were analyzed, such as charters of organizations, contracts with staff, lists of regulations, and so forth. Also, interviews were conducted with officers of the organizations and with parents whenever possible.

The original typology appeared to bear up well under this first test. However, it seemed advisable to seek further evidence of the usefulness of the typology. As Kuhn (1962) points out, the basic criterion for acceptance or rejection of any new paradigm, of which a typology is a primitive version, is its utility for explaining observed phenomena. This was done by subjecting several of the hypotheses, which were drawn from the typology, to further tests. Because of the subjective nature of the observational study, it was hoped to use more objective, quantitative methodology to collect further supporting data.

The problem at this stage was that the research design that was developed to demonstrate the utility of the typology could not be carried out in the same community where the observations had been done. Therefore, in order to carry out a statistical study to support the typology, the project was shifted to a new location.

The Statistical Study

The second year was devoted to a study of differences in elementary school achievement of children who had attended different types of preschools. Thus, whereas the first part of the project focused on the socialization process as it was influenced by organizational factors, the second part was concerned with analysis of socialization outcomes. Because of the number of variables involved, it was thought advisable to begin with a large pool of children from which relevant subsamples could be drawn. Accordingly, it was decided to use a school system as the locus of operations. In this way, it was hoped that differences between schools and between teachers would not seriously bias the results. Such a school system needed to be located in a community that contained at least two examples of each of the four types of preschools included in the typology so that the results would not be idiosyncratic to a specific institution. Second, because this was to be a post hoc design, it was necessary to find a community where information on preschool attendance was recorded systematically for every child in the system. Also, in order to escape the limitation of subjective judgments of achievement, it was hoped to find a school system where standardized, objective achievement tests were administered to all children of a given age or grade level.

Eventually, such a community was found and due to the unstinting cooperation of a large number of its personnel, these stringent requirements were more nearly met than had been thought possible. It should be noted that the cohort of children studied was one that had started kindergarten in 1967. Thus, in the Fall of 1969 achievement indices were available for the first two years of school. All children who had transferred into the school system after kindergarten, as well as a small group of early entrants (children who had started up to a year earlier than the rest of the cohort) were eliminated from the study. The results probably cannot be generalized except in very gross terms; it was impossible to rigorously define the universe and draw a probability sample. The representativeness of the sample population will be discussed further in Chapter VI.

One of the factors that could not be adequately controlled or analyzed was the quality of the program at the different types of preschools. For instance, since 1966 was the first year that year-round Head Start programs were offered in this community, it is quite possible that the program was less successful during that year than during subsequent years. However, the community had sponsored summer Head Start programs previously so that a certain amount of expertise in this area had been developed. Furthermore, the same argument was put forth by other types of preschool institutions. For instance, an official of the subsidized day care centers apologized for the lack of "organized program" during the target period. She reported that the quality of the program had been vastly upgraded during succeeding years. It is very difficult to evaluate the importance of these factors and even more difficult to bring them into the analysis in a scientifically acceptable fashion. Accordingly, this factor was eliminated from further analysis.

One of the inherent limitations of the statistical study was the exclusive reliance on available data. Because of the lack of resources, no additional testing program was instituted and no new questionnaire or interview information was collected. Two kinds of difficulties seem to have resulted. First, it soon became apparent that not all the children in the cohort had been tested or not all test scores had been recorded. The children who were not tested differed in some ways from those that were. This point will be discussed further in Chapters VI and VII as part of the statistical findings.

Second, because no new background data could be collected, the given demographic data can be considered accurate only for September, 1967, when the children were enrolled in kindergarten. At that time, these data were elicited in a private interview between the child's parent or guardian and a representative of the school. However, since some of these children started preschool when they were two years old and they were seven years of age when the final school evaluations were made, the data may fit neither the preschool situation nor the current picture. This is especially true of the number of siblings and parental occupation and, to some extent, of family structure.

Because the study was carried out in two different locations, it might be well to consider for a moment the similarities and differences between the two communities. Both are urban communities situated in the Midwest, about 150 miles apart. Both are relatively wealthy compared with the state as a whole, and both contain a lower income ghetto that is largely Black. Both have racially integrated school systems through extensive use of bussing. The per student school expenditures of the communities are well above the median for the district size in the state. Both school systems enjoy a reputation for excellence. Both have supported public kindergartens for several years. The educational climate of the two communities and that of the school system specifically is probably influenced greatly by the presence of a major university in each locale. However, in the community where the observational study was carried out, the university is very large and public and dominates the city. In the community where the statistical study was conducted, the university is small and private. The latter community, in contrast to the former, is a satellite to a contiguous, major metropolitan center, for which it functions as one of the bedroom towns. The university dominated city stands independently and exerts dominance over its surrounding rural territory. The large group of professionals in each community are the major consumers of private nursery school services, which constitute one of the four types of preschools.

In summary, the disjointed nature of this project offered some unique benefits and limitations. Its main disadvantage is that it precludes drawing a direct connection between the observations and statistical results because neither the socialization organizations nor the children who are the products of the socialization process, overlapped in the two parts of the study. The statistical results may not apply to children who attended the observed organizations and the observations cannot be extrapolated to the organizations that were attended by the children whose records were used for the statistical study. On the other hand, if the observations and the statistical findings point to the same conclusion, then the results may be more generalizable because they involve a larger number of organizations than could have been studied intensively. There is less reason to fear that the results are idiosyncratic if they are consistent across two communities than if they apply only to one.

Last, the combination of observations and statistical findings should satisfy one of the complaints voiced by Shils (1965) concerning the character of sociological research. He pointed out that much of the really significant data in a statistical study is contained in the footnotes. He complained that the most interesting results are not in the numerical core of the data but around the edges. It is hoped that by treating the statistical data as only one type of finding, to be combined with non-statistical data, that the total research effort will become more effective.

These two brief chapters have introduced the subject by presenting a rationale for the project and giving an outline of the various steps of the research process. The remainder of this report will be divided into three sections. Chapters III, IV and V will be devoted to the observational study of the first year. Chapters VI and VII will deal with the statistical study of the second year. Chapter VIII will summarize the conclusions and point to some implications for the future.

CHAPTER III

THE DIMENSIONS DEFINED

A study of preschools offers some particular advantages for the student of organizational theory because of the wide variety within the overall category. Preschools differ widely in their formal goals, in their organizational attributes, and in the source, form and level of financial support. The range of types is so great that examples can be found to fit, for instance, every possibility in Blau's typology of organizations by the criterion of chief beneficiary or cui bono (Blau, 1962, p. 43). Thus, "mutual-benefit associations," where the members themselves are the chief beneficiaries would fit the cooperative nursery schools. "Business concerns," where the owners are the prime beneficiaries, fits the private day care center that is run for profit. "Service organizations," where the client group is the prime beneficiary, applies to the professionally run nursery school. "Commonweal organizations," where the prime beneficiary is the public at large, is most applicable to day care centers that were set up to aid the war effort by freeing mothers to work in war related industries.

On the level of function, however, these organizations can all be subsumed in the pattern maintenance sector of society, as defined by Parsons (1951). This is so because they are clearly socialization agencies in terms of their effects. The distinction between formal goal and function is a crucial one for the study of these institutions.

One of the problems with past studies of preschools has been that the rhetoric about goals has diverted attention from their function. One of the primary contributions of this study will be to show the educational functions of preschools that were set up to offer a custodial service. The educational effects can be considered unintended in that they were not part of the primary goal of the organization. This study will focus on functions and treat goals as only one among many inputs that result in the functions that will be described. This distinction has been one of the main sensitizing concepts in this study of preschool institutions.

The focus of the study will be on the length of the preschool day and the socioeconomic status of the client group. These two factors were chosen because they have historical significance for the development of preschools and because they bear an important relationship to socialization process and outcome in preschool education today. For each factor, the present chapter will present a definition. This will be followed by a brief historical sketch to show how the factor was important in the history of preschool education. The final and most important section will list and discuss a set of propositions to show how the factor affects the socialization of children in the preschool context. The purpose will be to erect a theoretical scaffolding on which to hang the observations which will be described in the following chapter. It is important to remember that the sequence used here is a reversal of the actual research process as it was carried out. In reality, the propositions which will be listed in this chapter were invented to explain the previously observed phenomena. Such a procedure is legitimate in the light of Stinchcombe's (1968) discussion of the function of sociology. As he points out, sociologists tend to study social phenomena for which no theory is readily available. It is up to the sociologist to frame theoretical propositions which have maximum utility for explaining his observations.

Length of Day

Definition

For the purposes of this study long day preschool institutions will be defined as those that operate for about ten hours a day, usually from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. in order to encompass the working day. Short day preschool institutions are those that typically offer two to three hour sessions. Some of these offer two seperate sessions daily, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. It is characteristic of these institutions that the clientele for the two sessions do not overlap.

The distinction between long and short day institutions is not always as clearcut as the above would make it appear. Some children attend long day institutions for short sessions. This applies mainly not to preschoolers but to older, elementary school pupils who are sent before and/or after school and during lunch hours. Also, short day sessions are occasionally extended to as much as five or six hours to make them coextensive with the elementary school day. However, the programs in such schools are usually similar to those of short day schools and the extra hours are devoted to a long afternoon rest.

Historical Significance of Length of Day

This factor has always been important in the history of preschool education because long day institutions were set up to serve a different purpose than short day institutions. Long day institutions were designed primarily to meet the needs of parents, not of children. The first organizations of this type were set up during the Civil War as an aid to the war effort. Their expansion has been steady during the intervening years but characterized by spurts of growth during subsequent national emergencies. In 1892 there were about 90, in 1897 there were 175 and in 1928 there were about 600. During the depression, under WPA, such organizations came under federal support to relieve unemployment of mothers. Thus in 1936 the number of such organizations had increased to 1650 and in 1942 to about 3,000. When the WPA tapered off, World War II supplied a fresh stimulus to further growth with the establishment of the War Emergency Child Care Commission. At this time there is the first indication that these organizations began to be evaluated as educational institutions through provision for some form of educational review (Fuller, 1960).

Until this time, clear distinction had been maintained between the goals of the long day versus short day institutions. Long day institutions were conceived of as serving a custodial function. Their role in the education of young children was usually considered incidental to their main purpose. This distinction carried over into the names commonly given to the two types of institutions. Whereas short day institutions were usually designated as "schools," i.e. nursery schools, play schools, etc., long day institutions were traditionally called "day care centers." This distinction was not universally acknowledged. Maria Montessori's pioneering efforts were directed at the education of children who were placed in custodial institutions. However, this was an exception. The educational focus was generally reserved for short day institutions, which grew up in this country largely as an outgrowth of the scientific approach to the education of young children in the 1920's. Nursery schools became laboratory and training adjuncts for research institutions such as the Iowa Child Welfare Station, the Yale Psychological Clinic, the Merrill-Palmer School in Detroit, and others. Some nursery schools specialize in working with handicapped youngsters or others with specific needs. The focus in these institutions has always been primarily on providing a service for the child. The service is usually defined in some way as educational, or, occasionally, as therapeutic. In some programs the service has an educational component directed at the parents as well. This focus is integral to the parent cooperatives and it has become one of the features of the current Head Start programs.

Propositions Relating Length of Day to Socialization Process

The discussion below will focus on three types of propositions. First, we will consider the direct effects of the length of day on socialization process. Second, we will consider propositions in which length of day together with one or more other factors produce certain outcomes. Third, we will list some propositions which relate to long day institutions but are not directly connected with length of the school day itself. These might be considered historical accidents.

The main propositions will be numbered consecutively to permit easier identification throughout later portions of the study.

The first proposition relates the length of the school day to the effectiveness of socialization process in general. Children attending long day schools undergo more extensive exposure to the socialization process offered by the schools. There are two main reasons for this. First, children in long day schools are exposed more frequently to the same type of socialization experiences than children in short day schools. A child whose speech is poor will be corrected more often in the course of a long school day than in the course of a short school day. Also, a child who attends a long day school will be exposed to a greater variety of socialization experiences than a child who attends a short day school. Prescott and Jones (1967) in their study of a variety of long day schools point out that teachers in such institutions see one of their chief duties as providing a variety of different experiences to keep the children contented and occupied throughout the long day. In short day schools a few, standardized activities will fill the time but in long day schools a large number of different activities are needed to avoid the kinds of "trouble" that are a consequence of boredom.

Proposition 1. Long day schools offer more extensive exposure to socialization experiences than short day schools.

The second proposition relates length of the school day to learning of cognitive skills. This is an important issue because a number of experts in the field of compensatory education (Bereiter, 1966; Weikart, 1967) see the main function of short day schools, especially for disadvantaged children, in the area of teaching cognitive skills. This has become the central focus of many compensatory education programs and much effort has gone into explicit, planned training in this area. Long day programs, on the other hand, have never been defined as educational institutions. Some programs do include explicit training in cognitive skills but this is usually seen as one of many equivalent activities to keep the children occupied rather than as a central purpose of the program. Thus, short day programs focus on teaching cognitive skills to a much greater extent than long day programs.

However, it becomes necessary to raise the question whether cognitive skills may not be learned as much in programs where they are consciously taught as in programs where they are not. The anthropologist E. Hall (1959) has defined three modes for the transmission of culture, the "expert," the "formal," and the "informal." His thesis is that most learning probably takes place through formal and informal channels and only a small fraction is the result of explicit, conscious teaching which induces "expert" learning. Children in short day schools probably learn cognitive skills more through the "expert" mode. Children in long day schools may be learning as much in the area of cognitive skills as children in short day schools. However, they may be learning these skills primarily through the "formal" and "informal" mode, through extended interaction with adults and as a bi-product of the various kinds of activities that are offered to keep the children occupied throughout the long day.

Proposition 2. Long day schools offer as much cognitive training for children as short day schools.

The third proposition relates the length of the school day plus the staff-client ratio to the learning of social skills. Most formally organized socialization agencies including preschools are characterized by relatively low staff-client ratios (Wheeler, 1967). A small number of teachers or other caretakers are generally in charge of processing a large number of patients, clients, or children, depending on the types of persons who are served by the institution. Teacher-child ratios in long and short day preschools are approximately the same since this factor is regulated by state standards for licensing of such institutions. Therefore, the length of day is the main variable factor in the preschool context. The importance of the time factor becomes more explicit when we compare preschools with the total institutions described by Goffman (1951). In his study of Asylums, Goffman pointed out that when a small number of caretakers are in charge of a large number of inmates over a long period of time, the staff enforce a high level of orderliness and discipline as a mechanism for coping with the problems imposed by the social situation. As a result, total institutions tend to be run by means of rigid schedules and sets of rules that must be obeyed. Infractions of rules are seriously regarded and obedience is highly valued. Inmates are taught to conduct their affairs in such a fashion as to minimize disorder and, further, they are taught a variety of housekeeping skills in order that they will be able to aid the staff in keeping the organization running smoothly. Such insitutions are often characterized by goal displacement because the need to keep order takes priority over the need to offer therapeutic or other services which the clients sought when they entered the institutions. Of course, neither long nor short day preschools are total institutions because the children do go home at the end of the day. Nevertheless, it can probably be argued that long day preschools are more comparable to total institutions than short day preschools. D. Street (1967), for instance, speaks of the occupational disease of teachers who face large groups of children for many hours a day. As he says, this situation "is likely to induce a concern for order and discipline as paramount virtues for survival, no matter what the initial attitude." (p. 154) Children in these situations will be taught a number of social skills such as lowering their voices, sitting still, taking turns, etc. in order to produce the requisite atmosphere of order and discipline. The situation is different in short day schools because teachers (and children) can tolerate a far greater degree of disorder and chaos for a short time than for a long period of time. Therefore, although the teacher-student ratio is about the same in short day as in long day institutions, the emphasis on teaching social skills will be less in the former than in the latter.

Proposition 3. When the teacher-child ratio is kept constant, long day schools will emphasize teaching of social skills more than short day schools.

It is important to note that this proposition depends on two variables, length of the preschool day and teacher-child ratios. Therefore, it is possible to state a corrolary to the above proposition, as follows:

When the length of the school day is kept constant, there will be an inverse relationship between teacher-child ratios and the amount of emphasis on teaching of social skills.

The fourth proposition relates length of the school day to effectiveness of socialization through the intermediary variables of maternal employment and the existence of counterpressures to the socialization patterns inculcated by the preschools. In a sense this proposition is an extension of the first which related length of preschool day to effectiveness of the socialization process. Here we add the following factors. Children are generally enrolled in long day preschools because their mothers want to or have to work. Long day preschools are generally set up to provide custodial services to children of working mothers. Many day care centers will not accept a child unless there is a legitimate reason why the mother cannot care for him. Only a handful of mothers of children in long day schools are not working or studying and usually these situations involve sickness or other types of parental incapacity which have similar consequences as maternal employment.

Working mothers have a dual role and must fulfill two sets of obligations, those of the home and those of their employment. They are chronically rushed and fatigued. Consequently they tend to have less time and energy to devote to the socialization of their children than mothers who do not work. Therefore many of these working mothers tend to delegate the socialization process to the preschool teachers. Furthermore, because they lack surplus resources in time and energy, they are unlikely to exert effective counterpressures on their children when they do not share the values and goals of the teachers who are socializing their children. As Wheeler (1967) points out in his analysis of socialization process and outcome, the amount of counterpressure exerted on the object of socialization is an important determinant of the effectiveness of the socialization process.

Support for this line of argument also comes from studies of political behavior. Lipset (1963) summarizes a number of voting studies that are concerned with the effects of counterpressures. The main conclusion of these studies seems to be that when the amount of input (political information and exhortation through mass media) is kept constant, the outcome in terms of the subject's decision making and voting depends to a great extent on the existence of counterpressures. Thus, the effectiveness of political socialization is decreased by counterpressures much as the socialization process of preschools is hampered when children are subject to counterpressures by their families.

Proposition 4 will be stated in several steps, as follows:

Children attending long day preschools are more likely to have working mothers than children in short day preschools.

Working mothers have fewer resources (time and energy) available to invest in the socialization of their children than non-working mothers.

Working mothers are less likely to exert effective counterpressures to the socialization process of the preschools even when they disagree with the values and goals that their children learn at the institution.

Therefore, long day preschools provide more effective socialization than short day schools because the children attending them are less subject to counterpressures from their families.

The fifth proposition relates the length of the preschool day to the learning of interactional and motivational skills through the relationship between teachers and children in the insitutions. This relationship must be analyzed from the point of view of the children and of the teachers. The child's agent of socialization can be any person with whom the child plays an institutionalized role, his parent, his teacher, his friend, etc. (Brim, 1960). However, the child does not learn the same kinds of skills from all these role players. Probably he can learn cognitive skills from anybody. We gain information from strangers as well as from intimates. Social skills also can be readily learned even from persons with whom we have a superficial, instrumental relationship. Goffman's analysis of Asylums (1951) makes exactly this point. Inmates learned from their caretakers the social skills that they needed in order to conform to the rules of the institution. However, they did not derive therapeutic benefit from their caretakers perhaps because the therapist role is not consistent with the instrumental relationship that was characteristic of patients and staff at the mental hospital.

Motivational and interactional skills are notoriously difficult to learn through an instrumental relationship. This point has been made by a number of persons who have been involved with teaching disadvantaged children. As Toby (1957) points out, the middle class child does good work in elementary school not because his teacher can persuade him to learn the material but because his family reinforce the values of the school and thus motivate him to learn. His motivational skills do not come from this teacher but from his parents. Similarly, a child does not learn from his elementary school teacher to trust the adults in his environment and to use them to increase his knowledge of the world. The elementary school teacher can use the child's previously acquired interactional skills to help him achieve mastery in new areas but she cannot give him the basic tools. This is because she has an instrumental relationship with the children in her class.

Thus, in order to develop the basic motivational and interactional skills, a child must have a maternal type relationship with a person who will teach him these skills. It will be suggested here that this type of relationship is more likely to develop between teachers and children in long day than in short day preschools. As Whiting (1960) points out, one of the prerequisites for such a relationship is that the teacher has control over resources that are valuable to the child. This is much more true in long than in short day schools. In long day schools the child essentially depends on the teacher to meet all his physical and emotional needs during most of his waking hours. A child who attends a short day school may be able to manage without solace for his hurt, approval for his accomplishments, food, or a change of clothes during the 2-3 hour session but he would not be able to do so during the 10-11 hour day. The teacher in a long day school has almost the same type of control over the child's environment as the mother. The child learns from the teacher because of his dependence on her. The mechanisms for this learning do not necessarily depend on conscious teaching. As was pointed out in discussion of the second proposition, much learning is of the "formal" and "informal" type (Hall, 1959), and this is especially true of motivational and interactional skills. Translated in Whiting's terms (1960) we would say that in the long day school the child learns through identification. He learns because he strives to please by becoming like his teacher.

The teacher for her part also contributes to this relationship. We would suggest that the teacher in long day schools has a different type of commitment to her job than teachers in short day schools. Whereas teachers in short day schools are attracted to their work by extrinsic factors such as convenience and income, teachers in long day schools are more attracted by intrinsic factors, specifically their liking for children and their desire to act as substitute mothers to the children entrusted to their care.

Proposition 5 can be summarized in the following set of statements:

Children are more dependent on teachers in long than in short day schools.

Teachers are more emotionally involved with children in long than in short day schools.

The inculcation of motivational and interactional skills presupposes a diffuse, affective relationship between teacher and learner.

Therefore, in long day schools, because teachers and children develop a diffuse, affective relationship, the children learn more motivational and interactional skills than in short day schools where the relationship between teachers and children is more specific and neutral.

It should be added that in short day schools children have the advantage of learning to develop an instrumental type relationship with their teachers which is more directly transferable to the elementary school situation than the affective teacher-child relationship that is characteristic of long day schools. However, this is probably a minor advantage and is more than offset by the learning of motivational and interactional skills that result from the more affective teacher-child relationship in long day schools.

The sixth proposition relates specificity of formal goal to clarity of focus in the educational process. The relationship between goal specificity and productivity of the organization has been noted by various authors. For instance, Selznick, in his study of Leadership in Administration (1957) showed that one of the important determinants of the output of the organization is the specificity and primacy of the formal goal. When the formal goal is diffuse or not widely shared, goal displacement is more likely to occur. Burton Clark's study of adult education in California (1956) demonstrated how goal displacement occurs when the formal goal of the organization is weakened by adaptation to precarious values. As Selznick has pointed out (1956), every organization has multiple goals. The two chief types are those related to the formal goal of the organization and those related to organizational maintenance. In a situation of scarcity there is competition for obtaining resources to meet these two types of goals. Therefore, unless the formal goals of the organization are clear, salient, and widely accepted among the members, the goals of organizational maintenance are able to gain priority with consequent goal displacement.

Historically, one of the differences between long and short day preschools has been in the specificity of the formal goals. In general, long day schools have been set up with the somewhat unspecific goal of providing good custody for children whereas short day institutions have been given a much more specific educational or therapeutic mandate.

Proposition 6. Short day schools, because of their more specific formal goals, provide children with much more clearly focused training (especially in cognitive skills) than long day schools, which are generally set up mainly to provide custody.

This proposition has a corrolary as follows:

Long day schools, because of their less specific formal goals devote more resources than short day schools towards enhancing organizational functioning and therefore tend to emphasize the teaching of social skills.

The seventh and last proposition concerning differences between long and short day preschools relates the method by which children are introduced into the peer group of the organization to socialization outcome. The importance of this factor has been most clearly set out by Wheeler (1967). He distinguishes between serial and disjunctive induction into formally organized socialization settings. In the disjunctive form of induction the objects of socialization are brought to the setting in batches, as in schools or summer camps. In this situation, the socialization process emanates almost wholly from the teacher who is the only one who is aware of the roles and thus able to transmit them. The advantage of this system is that the teacher has complete control over the socialization process, which is an important asset in institutions where a subculture of inmates may serve to subvert the official socialization policy. On the other hand, the system is inefficient because the teacher has to carry out the entire socialization process alone.

In the serial form of induction, newcomers are brought singly into an ongoing peer group. In this situation the socialization process is far more efficient, provided that the socializing agent and the per group agree on the information that needs to be transmitted. If this consensus obtains, the peer group reinforces the socialization process initiated by the socializing agent and the newcomer adapts much more quickly to the socialization setting.

In the preschool situation, due to historical factors, the long day schools tend to induct children serially whereas short day schools induct disjunctively. This difference is closely related to the goals of the two types of institutions. Because long day schools are designed to offer services to working mothers, they must be able to accept children whenever mothers start to work. Short day schools, on the other hand, since they have traditionally defined themselves as educational institutions, have also copied many of the other characteristics of schools including the academic calendar. Therefore, children attending these schools usually start as a group at the beginning of the year or the semester, much as they would in other academic institutions.

Proposition 7. The socialization process at long day schools is more efficient because newcomers are inducted serially and socialization process is reinforced by the peer group. Conversely, the socialization process at short day schools is relatively less efficient because newcomers are inducted disjunctively and the socialization process is handled by the teacher alone.

Socioeconomic Status of the Client Group

Definition

For the purposes of this study we will define as low socioeconomic status those children who are eligible for free or almost free preschool programs. The "disadvantaged" or "underprivileged" or "deprived" form a prominent sector of this population because the dividing line that seperates those eligible for free programs from those not eligible is usually drawn at an income level that is close to the prevailing definition of poverty. All those not eligible will be considered of high socio-economic status. It is apparent that this latter group includes a wide spectrum within the total population.

Historical Significance of Socioeconomic Status of Client Group

This factor has always been important in preschool education because these institutions have tended to be homogenious with regard to the socioeconomic status of their clientele. Historically, in this country there has been a basic dichotomy between charitable institutions for the poor and paying institutions for everyone else. Acceptance into a "free" institution has always depended on some form of a means test. Until the very recent past, the supply of free or almost free preschool facilities was chronically short of demand so that rigid eligibility requirements could be enforced. Furthermore, the primary goal of the institution traditionally differed according to the socio-economic status of the dominant client group. Charitable institutions were generally set up to provide a custodial service whereas paying institutions were organized to provide educational services.

In recent years this distinction has disappeared. New types of institutions have been developed to provide educational services for the poor and custodial services for those able to pay. Actually, there is some evidence that educational preschool programs for the poor, which we tend to regard as a modern invention, originating with Head Start, actually existed already in the colonial period. However, these early "Women's Schools," as they were known, certainly cannot compare in scope with the current Head Start program, which brought about a fundamental realignment of preschool goals with socioeconomic status of the client group.

Head Start was designed precisely to compensate for the known educational deficiencies of low socioeconomic status children. These programs tend to be more strictly educational than the traditional, middle class nursery schools and this trend is being accentuated. Head Start centers also differ from traditional charitable institutions because they engage in active recruitment of clientele. These programs are not regarded as a privilege for a chosen few. They are designed to serve the maximum number of youngsters who need such services. Although the income requirements for different subsidized programs vary somewhat, the maximum tends to be set as close as possible to federal guidelines for defining poverty. In some programs, most notably privately subsidized day care centers, a sliding scale of fees is used depending on a family's ability to pay. In federally subsidized Head Start programs the client never pays but the requirements state that not more than a small proportion (about 10% to 15%) of the children served by a center may come from families with incomes above the poverty line.

The recent expansion of day care centers for middle class groups has been stimulated by the growing proportion of women in the labor force (Report on Day Care, 1964). Many of these women work by choice rather than from necessity. In part they are influenced by the cumulating evidence that children are not harmed in their psychological and physical development of the mothers' working (Swift, 1964, p. 258). Thus, the women who previously stated at home with their children because of their guilt over the potential harm they would inflict on their children by working, are increasingly enrolling their children in private day care centers and accepting work for themselves. These private day care centers vary greatly in quality. Some offer a strong educational program as well as good care for the child but the custodial program is still the essential part of the service. Fees vary somewhat, but tend to be competitive within a given community. About $20 per week per child seemed to be modal in 1968 in the community where the observations were carried out.

It should be noted that preschools are usually not completely homogenious with respect to client socioeconomic status. There are several types of obvious exceptions. For instance, children of university students often attend free institutions because of their parents' temporarily low income; "scholarship" children in high socioeconomic status institutions provide another example. These are interesting cases precisely because the problems these children encounter or cause in their "inappropriate" settings point up the congruence between the programs and the majority client populations.

Propositions Relating Socioeconomic Status of Client Group to Socialization Process and Outcome

In order to simplify this section, we shall present only two sets of propositions which will be dealt with directly in this study.

The remainder of the theoretical scaffolding in this section will consist of two important assumptions. These will be stated and the evidence from the literature pertaining to these will be presented before the section dealing with the propositions themselves.

The first assumption concerns the middle class character of American elementary schools. Evidence to this effect runs through Gramb's study of contemporary American education, Schools, Scholars and Society (1965). Schools are conservative institutions that mirror not so much the contemporary needs of their client populations but the values of the middle class teachers, administrators, textbook writers, and members of their controlling school boards (Charters, 1953). The procedures and goals of the school relate to a middle class way of life. The middle class family inculcates and reinforces the values of the school and the middle class (high socioeconomic status) child therefore moves relatively smoothly through the educational system. The lower class child, on the other hand, experiences considerable difficulty in adapting himself to these middle class educational institutions which he also is required to attend.

The second assumption concerns socioeconomic status related differences in socialization aims and practices. M. Kohn (1963) has clearly outlined the most important class related differences in child rearing. He found that whereas low socioeconomic status parents place greater value on obedience, neatness, and cleanliness, high socioeconomic status parents stress curiosity, happiness, consideration and self control in their child rearing practices. Low socioeconomic status parents value conformity to external prescriptions whereas high

socioeconomic status parents value self direction. It is only a small step to note that the latter value has been institutionalized by the modern elementary school in the effort expended to stimulate children to work by themselves for the sake of mastery of material that the children are supposed to find intrinsically interesting. Rote learning in response to the teachers' commands has
a learning technique. Yet the latter is more consonant with the low socioeconomic status child's socialization and previous experience with learning.

As Fowler (1968) points out, the low socioeconomic status mother subscribes to a different set of values in child rearing than the high socioeconomic status mother. The low socioeconomic status mother spends a great deal of energy in telling her child to "be good," which means being physically inactive, verbally non-participative, and non-observant (p. 258). This set of prescriptions is consonant with the social conditions of low socioeconomic status life, which are characterized by crowding and disorder. The high socioeconomic status child, on the other hand, is encouraged to be physically and intellectually active, inquisitive, and engaged in efforts to master the environment (Bereiter, 1966). Thus, it seems clear that socialization patterns are related to socioeconomic status differences and that these will have an important effect on the child's potential success in elementary school.

The first three propositions in this section deal with the relationship between family socialization patterns, preschool attendance and success in elementary school among low socioeconomic status children.

The nature of the relationship between low socioeconomic status socialization practices and elementary school achievement is by no means clearly defined. Various authors who have been involved in the education of disadvantaged children seem to disagree along two dimensions. First, they question whether low socioeconomic status children are deficient in their knowledge and skills compared with high socioeconomic status peers or whether they are different. Bereiter (1966), for instance, believes that low socioeconomic status children suffer from a deficiency as a result of their training. As he says, "With no known exceptions, studies of 3-5 year old children from low socioeconomic status backgrounds have shown them to be retarded or below average in every intellectual ability (p. 3-4). Reissman (1962), on the other hand, ascribes the facts to differences in culture. He points to the lack of relevance of school learning for the problems faced by the lower class child. He suggests that the behavior patterns of the low socioeconomic child are related to his culture and to the problems that dominate his life. He argues that the procedures and goals of the school are incompatible with the child's home experiences and incomprehensibe to him. School experiences do not relate to the everyday problems of low socioeconomic status children, how to survive in a slum, how to escape muggings and molestations, how to outwit his enemies, etc. The world of the school is so far removed from the child's reality that he cannot be persuaded to engage himself in the "make believe" life of the middle class classroom.

The other sources of disagreement among this group of authors relates to the priority of causes for the observed socioeconomic status related differences in school achievement. Some authors believe that cognitive skills are the primary factor. Bernstein (196), for instance, has shown that socioeconomic status differences in language modes influence a wide range of perception and behaviors. Cynthia Deutsch (1967) has made a case for the importance of auditory discrimination skills. Martin Deutsch (1967), among others, has shown that the low socioeconomic status child lacks requisite interactional skills. A low socioeconomic child may not have learned how to use the adults in his environment to obtain answers to his questions and to increase his understanding of the world in which he lives. Toby (1957), on the other hand, has emphasized motivational skills as of primary importance. He argues that school is not a particularly pleasant experience for most children of all social classes. The difference between low and high socioeconomic children is that in the latter case the home supports the school in that it reinforces the reward system of the classroom. The middle class mother praises her child for his academic efforts whereas the low socioeconomic child receives no recognition at home for his efforts at school.

Proposition 8. The low socioeconomic status child does not learn at home the skills needed for success in school.

Proposition 9. In order to compensate for his "disadvantage" the low socioeconomic status child needs a preschool experience to enable him to compete with his high socioeconomic status peers.

Proposition 10. Therefore, attendance at preschool will be related to success at elementary school among low socioeconomic status children.

The second set of propositions in this section deal with the relationship between family socialization patterns, preschool attendance and success in elementary school among high socioeconomic status children. Our best evidence in this area derives from the correlational studies that relate socioeconomic status to school achievement. Invariably, the authors establish a positive correlation between these two factors, no matter how they operationalize them. Folger (1967), for instance, points out in his summary of census material that at every grade a clear positive correlation exists between socioeconomic status and school achievement.

It is not clear exactly what aspects of family socialization contribute most significantly to the high socioeconomic status child's success at elementary school. However, considering our first assumption concerning the middle class character of elementary schools it is hardly surprising that high socioeconomic status children should find it easy to do well in a situation that is highly compatible with their home experiences. Strodtbeck (1967) has summarized the issue most clearly in his analysis of the "Hidden Curriculum of the Middle Class Home." The middle class child is encouraged at home to be active and inquisitive. He is encouraged to master new skills and he is taught to believe that he will eventually be successful in achieving his goals. He is also taught the cognitive, social, motivational and interactional skills that he needs for success in school. Thus, the socialization process of the middle class child is continuous from the home to the school. He experiences a minimum of conflict and discontinuity. He does not need to unlearn in the new situation that which he has learned previously. The skills that he learned at home are by and large transferable to the school situation. Accordingly, he does not need the additional preschool experience to prepare him for school. Therefore, it is hardly surprising, as Karnes (1968) pointed out, that there is little evidence to demonstrate the advantages of preschool attendance for school success among high socioeconomic status children.

Proposition 11. The high socioeconomic status child acquires at home the skills that he needs in order to succeed in elementary school.

Proposition 12. The high socioeconomic status child does not need a preschool experience to enable him to compete with his peers.

Proposition 13. Therefore, preschool attendance will not be related to success at elementary school among high socioeconomic status children.

Summary

In this chapter we have discussed the two major variables in this study of preschool education, the length of the preschool day and the socioeconomic status of the client group. For each factor we have presented a definition. This has been followed by a discussion of the historical importance of this factor for the development of preschool institutions. The main purpose of this chapter has been to construct a set of propositions to serve as the theoretical framework of this study. The 13 propositions, which were listed, cannot account for all the assumptions and hypotheses which are implicit in this study. Instead, they were designed to demonstrate major facets of the relationship between these two variables with the socialization process in preschools and socialization outcome in terms of the children's subsequent achievement in elementary school.

CHAPTER IV

THE DIMENSIONS APPLIED

This chapter will begin with an analysis of the factors that are constants in preschool institutions. This will be followed by a discussion of how the two dimensions that were defined in the last chapter affect the socialization process in different types of preschools.

The Constants

The most obvious factor is the age of the children. Children of two to five years of age have a given range of needs and abilities. This means, for instance, that the specificity of any program is limited by the need to provide for the general health and welfare of a child who is not able to satisfy his own basic physical and psychological needs. The pediatrician can provide a highly specific service because the mother is present while he attends to the child. In the preschool situation, on the other hand, the child is left without his mother. Someone at the institution must fulfill the maternal functions, even at schools that offer a highly focused, educational program.

One of the prerequisites for the formation of subcultures, however, is that the peer group can perform useful functions for its members. Goffman (1961) shows in his analysis of the "underworld" of a mental hospital the various amenities that patients can provide for each other. Similarly, Sykes (1958) shows how the inmate group of a prison becomes a channel for the sale and purchase of goods and services as well as a necessary source of support for exerting pressure on the staff. In the preschool situation, on the other hand, the children are too dependent on the staff to exert much counterpressure. Fellow students cannot provide much help except in very trivial situations such as building a structure or playing a game. When the children are unhappy they turn to the teacher for help and support. The only case where a child was observed to turn to a peer was in the case of two siblings in the same school. Therefore, although some children misbehave and resist staff demands, this is usually an individual rather than a group phenomenon.

A second constant is that teachers as an occupational group tend to be middle class. W. Waller, in his classic analysis of The Sociology of Teaching (1965), describes at length the middle class virtues that teachers were expected to embody. They could indulge in no vices. Their behavior had to be decorous. They were expected to teach and to live by the puritan ethic. In the past, teaching was one of the few respectable occupations for a middle class female. Today, teachers are drawn from a wider socioeconomic status range but they continue to define themselves and to be defined as occupants of a middle class occupational status (Lieberman, 1956).

This characteristic comes through clearly in the transformation that occurs when lower class women are drawn into preschool teaching, usually through employment at Head Start centers. Dr. Kunkel, who conducts short term training programs for Head Start trainees described the process in a personal communication. She said that the recruits changed dramatically during the short training periods, in their appearance, in their conception of themselves and in their attitudes and expectations for the future. They became more attractive. Their self concept was enhanced and they became more ambitious. Several of these women, who had not completed high school when they joined the program, have since finished their high school education and started a college program while continuing to work as preschool teachers in ghetto schools. Her data support some of the findings from interviews conducted with preschool teachers for this study. All respondents were asked to describe their position or title. All except 2 of the 21 interviewees described themselves as "teachers" and/or "directors." The two exceptions described themselves as "helpers." One of these women had worked at Head Start for less than a month and the other suffered from numerous personality difficulties which manifested themselves in a serious lack of self confidence.

The "middle classness" of preschool teachers has an important bearing on this study because of the effect this has on the socialization of low socioeconomic status children. As Parsons (1951) and others have pointed out, imitation is one of the prime mechanisms of socialization. The old adage about "setting an example" and the saying, "As the twig is bent, the tree is inclined" are to the point. If we study socialization process, we must take into account what the children learn, not just what the teachers officially teach. This is especially important in long day settings, where teachers become a prime "significant other" for the children they serve. This is not as true of short day schools where the relationship between teachers and children is more instrumental (see proposition 5). In long day schools the teacher-child relationship is more expressive, and the teacher becomes part of the child's primary group in Cooley's terms, and thus exerts a powerful influence on the socialization process. This is especially important in the case of lower socioeconomic status children, where the middle class teachers exemplify a set of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that may be at variance with what the child learns at home. For such children, extensive exposure to preschool teachers can be very helpful for their later adjustment to the middle class oriented elementary school.

A third constant in the preschool situation is the dominance of theories and practices that grew out of the Child Study Movement of the 1920's and 1930's. This body of knowledge and techniques is based on extensive study of middle class children. This is not the only body of knowledge and techniques available for preschool education. Rather, it represents the "traditional" viewpoint and is sharply criticized by the modern "experimentalists" in the field (Katz, 1970). The latter represent a variety of points of view. Their common denominator is their disagreement with "traditional" theories, which they describe as no longer useful. As they point out, the norms of child behavior developed from the "traditional" knowledge base are not appropriate for the lower socioeconomic status clientele who are the chief focus of concern today.

Nevertheless, the "traditional" point of view persists in the majority of preschools. There are many reasons for this. First, most of the "highly trained" teachers have come through departments of home economics where these theories are emphasized. Second, the experts who conduct in-service training programs for the otherwise untrained teachers have usually come through the same type of training. Consequently, the untrained teachers reflect this point of view as well. Third, staff of licensing agencies are usually trained in the same way. Licensing of preschools is generally required by state law. The details of the law and the standards may differ but the patterns are similar. A state agency is designated to investigate all preschools to determine whether they meet appropriate standards. This ensures that minimum standards of health and safety will be met. However, the licensing staff also act as consultants to the preschools and often help to plan the program and offer advice when the teachers run into difficulties. Thus, the licensing program results in further support for "traditional" theories and techniques.

Two groups of teachers observed in the study were relatively untouched by this point of view. One consisted of teachers who had not been exposed to any formal training. They were guided essentially by "rules of thumb" or by previous experience. The other consisted of teachers who took part in a university organized demonstration program for disadvantaged children. The originators of this program were among the "experimentalists" and stated firmly that they would not employ teachers who had been trained in the "traditionalist" perspective. In summary, the great majority of preschool teachers, regardless of the setting in which they work, still subscribe to the theories and practices that grew out of the study of the middle class child. Material will be presented later to show some of the problems that result when teachers attempted to apply this perspective to an inappropriate client population.

This section has been devoted to an outline of three constants, the age of the children, the middle class socioeconomic status of teachers as an occupational group, and the dominance of theories and techniques predicated on study of the middle class child. The implications of these factors were briefly noted but these points will become clearer in conjunction with the observational data. The remainder of this chapter will deal with the two dimensions discussed in the last chapter. The purpose will be to show how the length of day and socioeconomic status of the client group affect the socialization process.

Implications of Length of Day

Extent of Exposure

Long day schools are more effective socialization agencies than short day schools. There are several reasons for this. The first is that children in these settings have more extensive exposure to the socialization process. They simply spend more time in the setting (see proposition 1).

Long day schools are open more hours in the day and more days in the year. Children enrolled in a day care center spend up to 10½ hours per day there. As one teacher said, "They're not completely awake when they get here and they are tired by the time they leave." In contrast, short day schools usually offer a 2-3 hour a day program. Children who attend short day schools spend the bulk of their waking hours outside the school. A few long day schools are closed in the summer but typically they are open all the working days in the year. Short day schools, on the other hand, tend to follow the academic calendar with vacations at Christmas, Easter, during the summer, and often between semester.

Furthermore, attendance patterns at the two types of schools differ. On a typical day in a short day school about one-third of the youngsters might be absent. In long day schools, most of the children come every day. The difference is reflected in the handling of illness at the two types of schools. One teacher, for instance, when asked to describe the disadvantages of working in a day care center mentioned that she was frequently ill with infections that she picked up from the children. All winter long the children cough and sneeze. The teachers put boxes of tissues all around the school rooms but even that doesn't help much. From Fall to Spring the teachers and children pass one infection after another back and forth. She knew that it couldn't be helped. "You can't turn away a child when his mother has to go to work. We take them unless they're too sick to get out of bed." For this reason, licensing laws require that day care centers make provision for the possibility of illness. Medical care has to be available as well as an isolation room.

In many short day schools, on the other hand, children are given a health check when they arrive at school every day. If a teacher decides that a child does not appear completely well, he is sent back home. In one school, for instance, the official regulations state that a child must be kept at home at least the first four days after he has caught a cold, no matter how well he may feel.

The carpool drivers report to the teacher why certain children did not come. "Sally's mother said that the child had a nightmare last night," was a typical, excuse. "Tommy wanted to go downtown with his mother," was another example. In some cases, teachers have no idea why children don't come. One Head Start teacher guessed that some mothers don't want to bother to get the kids ready. Another teacher explained, "The children come to the bus and then turn around and run away instead of getting in." Children at short day schools stay away for trivial reasons because the service offered by the school is not interpreted as very important. Thus, children at long day schools are more consistently exposed to the socialization process than children at short day schools.

Teacher-Child Relationships

A second reason for the more effective socialization in long day schools is that the teachers become more emotionally involved with the children in these settings (see proposition 5). Several of the teachers in the day care centers spoke of their strong affection for the children. When a child was withdrawn from the school, the teacher described it as a personal loss. In the course of their interviews, a number of day care center teachers said that the greatest source of satisfaction was the affection of the children. "I love to see their big smiles when they come in the morning," said one.

Many of these teachers were aware of their maternal role in relation to the children. "Sometimes I think I'm more like a mother to them than their real mother," said one. "Sometimes I'm more like a mother and sometimes I'm more like a teacher. It depends on what I'm doing. These children need a lot of loving and they don't get enough at home." Teachers were very concerned when the children were not adequately cared for at home. They willingly spent their own time and resources to remedy the deficiencies. For instance, at one day care center, the director said that she was always trying to discourage the teachers from doing too much. One of the children had been wearing shoes that were clearly too small. The teacher had wanted to go out and buy her a new pair but the director had insisted that they find her a used pair in a thrift shop. Another teacher was observed mending the children's clothes during nap time. She said that she didn't mind doing it and she didn't think that the mother would get around to it. In the day care centers teachers and children develop a strong expressive bond. As a consequence teachers become important "significant others" to the children they teach, which enhances their effectiveness as socializing agents.

In short day schools, on the other hand, teachers and children develop a more affectively neutral, instrumental relationship. Teachers were aware that to the children they were providers of fun or enablers to help the children to attain their individual goals. The teachers said that they found it difficult to provide enough fun and novelty to keep the children stimulated and satisfied. However, if the children were bored, they complained to their parents, which usually led to trouble.

Displays of affection were regarded as unprofessional especially in short day schools. One head teacher complained that her assistant liked to take children on her lap when she read stories to them but the superior thought it unwise "because the other children will feel jealous even if they don't show it. It is much better not to start something like that."

When teachers in short day schools were asked for their main source of satisfaction in their work, several mentioned the opportunity "to try out new teaching ideas." For one teacher the main source of satisfaction was "to watch the children catch on to what I've been trying to teach." Thus, in contrast to teachers in long day schools, teachers in short day schools found their main satisfaction in trying out a variety of techniques and in enhancing their professional capabilities through the children.

Reinforcement of Socialization by Peers

Another reason that children are more effectively socialized in long day schools is because the socialization process is reinforced by the children (see proposition 7). In long day schools, children are introduced serially. They enter the day care center when mother accepts a job and they leave when mother is fired or resigns. This means that they are introduced one by one into an ongoing peer group. Consequently, the other children, who have already learned the required behaviors help to socialize the newcomer. Day care teachers are quite aware of this process. A new child came for the first time during one of the observation periods. The teacher remarked in an aside, "You watch. I won't have to teach him what he has to do here. The other children will do it for me." Another teacher said that she systematically assigned each newcomer to one of her senior students who taught the new child all he needed to know.

In contrast, children who attend short day schools are usually introduced disjunctively. This means that a group of new recruits are introduced to the setting simultaneously. None of them is familiar with the requirements of the school. Socialization is performed only by the staff. This is always a difficult process. Teachers in short day schools who were asked to cooperate with the study invariably requested that no observations take place during the first month after school starts. "It takes at least a month before the children settle down," was one comment. "The first month or so is just hell," was another. This socialization process is especially difficult in the case of lower socioeconomic status children who have more to learn to enable them to adequately fulfill the expected role requirements.

Counterpressures

Another important reason why long day schools are more effective as socializing agencies is because the parents of the children who attend such schools are frequently exhausted by the strain of working plus domestic duties. They willingly cede the socialization process to the preschool teachers (see proposition 4). The teachers did not regard this as an advantage. They complained in their interviews about the lack of interest or lack of authority that parents showed in their dealings with their children. Several teachers said, "The parents baby the children." "They let them get away with anything." "If I didn't train the children they would just run wild." "I keep telling the mothers that its more important for them to spend some time with the children than to get supper on the table on time. The mothers don't listen to me. They just want to get the children fed and into bed." Thus it can be seen that teachers at long day preschools become the chief locus of socialization not by choice but through default.

As we pointed out in the last chapter, effectiveness of socialization depends on the strength of counterpressures on the objects of socialization. Counterpressures are generated by persons who have time and energy to invest and the motivation to do so. This principle has some interesting socioeconomic status implications. Mothers of low socioeconomic status day care children probably have less surplus time and energy available than mothers of high socioeconomic status day care children. Low socioeconomic status mothers are more likely to be employed in physically taxing work such as domestic labor or factory work than in white collar occupations. Their household chores are more fatiguing because they cannot afford to pay for help or to buy many labor saving devices. They are less likely to be living with a husband who could share housekeeping and child rearing burdens. On the other hand, low socioeconomic status parents have potentially greater motivation for exerting counterpressures. Melvin Kohn (1963) has pointed out that lower class families have different parental values and child rearing patterns than middle class families. Teachers tend to be middle class in their orientation. Therefore, middle class parents are probably more satisfied with socialization patterns of preschools than lower class parents. Thus, the lower class parent might like to exert counterpressure but is unable to do so, whereas the middle class parent may be more able but is less motivated to do so. These factors combine to maintain counterpressures at a relatively low level in long day schools.

In short day schools it makes no sense to speak of counterpressures because these schools cannot offer a complete socialization experience even by default. The child's main socialization experiences must come from elsewhere, from his family or a baby sitter or some other course.

Variety of Socialization Experiences

Long day schools also provide more effective socialization because there is enough time for a variety of socialization experiences (see proposition 1). As a member of a licensing agency explained, "Day care centers give the children everything that nursery schools (short day schools) offer but they do a great deal besides. These children are learning every minute, at nap time, at meal time, as well as during formal program time."

In long day schools there is plenty of time both for work and play. One day care center teacher proudly exhibited a shelf of picture books which she used to teach children how to play. She explained that some of the children really had never really learned how to play and this was just as important as learning how to work.

At all day care centers there is also a strong emphasis on work. There are several types of work. For instance, housekeeping is a major activity. Housekeeping tasks are a prominent feature of long day schools for several reasons. Teachers are exhausted from the long working hours they spend with the children and need the children's help with tasks which they otherwise would have to do themselves. Some schools employ extra staff to carry out janitorial services but even in those cases the job of "tidying up" is carried out by the teaching staff. Since one of the central problems of teachers in long day schools is to keep the children occupied and amused, the teachers find that housekeeping activity also serves as a good time filler.

Housekeeping activities can also be used for teaching other types of skills. By putting away toys, children learn spatial relationships, e.g. the larger goes on the bottom and the smaller on top. By tidying up their school, the children learn to produce order in their environment. Gray et al (1968) have shown the important implications of this skill for learning to integrate environmental stimuli. According to this theory, one of the reasons that low socioeconomic status children have trouble learning is that their environment lacks order and spatial and temporal organization. Children deal with this disordered environment by defending themselves against the onslaught of new stimuli. Therefore, they cannot use the stimuli that are available to them to produce learning.

Furthermore, children are given a great deal of praise and positive reinforcement for their housekeeping activity in long day schools. Children are commended for being good "helpers" and they are rewarded for other types of accomplishments by being allowed to "help" the teacher in new and special ways. For instance, the task of setting table is often a reward for excellence in tidying away toys. To be allowed to help in the kitchen is frequently defined as an even more sought after reward. As a result, children learn to expect positive feedback for their actions from adults, which in turn, has important implications for the ability of the teacher to motivate a child towards scholastic achievement (see proposition 5).

Closely related to the emphasis on housekeeping tasks is the effort expended in long day schools on teaching children social skills. As we discussed in the last chapter, long day preschools share some of the characteristics of total institutions (Goffman, 1951) especially in the need to maintain a high level of order and discipline (see prosposition 3). Thus the children are taught to lower their voices, to follow directions, to take turns at this and that activity, and so forth. All of these skills are directly transferable to the elementary school situation. According to the thesis put forward in this study, the learning of social skills is one of the major contributions of long day preschools and one that is closely related to later school achievement. Conversely, one of the major deficiencies of short day preschools is that they neglect to teach children the social skills that are necessary for subsequent school achievement. In their efforts to maintain the educational focus of short day schools, many teachers consciously avoid teaching social skills (see proposition 6). This is especially true in preschool programs with a strong cognitive orientation and a high staff-client ratio (see proposition 3). One of the important questions that can be raised by this study is whether the children are helped or hampered by a studied neglect of social skills. According to M. Deutsch (1960) the learning of social skills is necessary for classroom functioning. If children have not learned them previously elementary school teachers are forced to spend a larger fraction of their time and energy on discipline and related efforts. Such an allocation of resources means that less time will be available for academic training after the children enter elementary school.

At this point, it might be useful to consider the special case of Montessori schools. These are short day schools which place a great deal of emphasis on housekeeping and self help skills. Children who attend these schools are expected to spend their time in work. These characteristics must be related to the historical origins of these schools.

The Montessori method was designed to be used in long day institutions for low socioeconomic status children. However, their author was well aware of the educational value of these skills.

Contemporary Montessori schools have become expensive, short day institutions for a very sophisticated clientele. The original principles continue to be used but they have been adapted to their new setting. For instance, children are still taught to use scales and weights but not because they need to know how to manipulate them for cooking and shopping. Instead, these skills are regarded as mechanisms for teaching concept formation regarding principles of weight and balance. A similar metamorphosis has occurred with regard to teaching self help skills. These skills have lost their utilitarian function. Today children manipulate specially designed and very expensive buttoning frames and lacing "shoes" to learn basic principles and underlying concepts. Thus the example of the Montessori schools shows how the emphasis on work which served a utilitarian function in long day schools, has been adapted to fit the more educational orientation of short day schools.

Another type of work is "school work." Many day care centers set aside time for formal academic training. In one school children were observed learning to write and read their own names and those of their classmates. In another, children were learning the names of all members of the President's family. One teacher announced that she was planning soon to give a "test" which she would "grade." She also promised the children some "homework" which they would do in the afternoon. All of this was accompanied by strict adherence to school rules, e.g. "don't speak without raising your hand," "Put your name at the top of the page," etc. Such activities accustom the children to some of the major features of school settings and teach them a variety of skills that will be useful when they enter primary schools.

Thus through work and through play children at long day schools are explicitly taught how to behave in a socially acceptable manner. Children are taught to be quiet and orderly. They practice walking on tip toe. They learn to distinguish "indoor" and "outdoor" voices. These skills are reinforced in their games and finger plays as well as in their songs and stories.

Short day schools do not provide such a diversity of socialization experiences because they are constrained by lack of time. For every activity that is added something must be eliminated. One of the chief problems of teachers in short day schools is to maintain focus on the primary goal of the organization in the face of children's unmet needs. For instance, several teachers said that a major problem was to handle children's misbehavior without "wasting time" on it. One common strategy was to attempt to ignore these problems. The teachers explained that sometimes it was possible to distract the children or to channel their energy into constructive activity without explicitly calling attention to the misbehavior. The resulting classroom atmosphere is often noisy and chaotic. After one particularly difficult session a teacher said, "I really can't stand all that noise and confusion. It makes me so nervous that I can't teach well. But if I stop to discipline the children, then I can't get through the program." The program in short day schools is the same as in long day schools. It includes, at a minimum, a free play period, individual activities, group activities, snack, rest, clean up and outdoor play but it must be condensed into a fraction of the time allotted in a long day school.

Several teachers mentioned that they particularly disliked leaving out experiences which they considered important for the children. For instance, these teachers were aware of the value of teaching children to clean up and care for their possessions but they felt unable to follow through on their conviction. "I try to get the children to clean up or at least to help me with it but actually I do most of it myself." "It's easier for me to do it myself after they're gone," said another teacher, "And I hate to spend the time while they're here."

In short day schools teachers always have to weigh the consequences of adding another activity or experience. "I know that their language is bad but if I stop to correct a child's speech, the others start acting up and then it takes me too long to get back to the program." Thus, the socialization experience is more limited in short day schools not because the teachers do not recognize the need for more but because they feel they cannot offer more within the school structure.

In summary, the greater effectiveness of the socialization process in long day schools can be related to several factors. Children who spend more time at these institutions are exposed to a greater variety of socializing experiences. The children's learning is enhanced because the children develop a strong emotional bond with the teachers, which is reciprocated by the adults in these settings. The socialization process is reinforced by the peer group because the children are introduced serially rather than disjunctively, which is the case in short day settings. Parents of children in long day schools usually do not exert effective counterpressure to patterns that are taught in the schools.

Short day schools, on the other hand, offer a more limited socialization experience because they are constrained by lack of time. For every activity that is added, another is eliminated. Teachers at these schools recognize that the children need training beyond what they can offer. However, they believe that they must adhere closely to the educational goal of the institution and therefore cannot provide a more complete socialization experience for the children.

Implications for Staff Characteristics

One of the indirect effects of length of day is that long day schools attract a different kind of staff than short day schools. This is compounded by the fact that the two types of schools offer very different salaries. Total salaries per month and per year are very similar which means that salaries per hour are from twice to four times as great in short day than in long day schools. The general salary in 1968 in the community where the observations took place was as follows:

Full Day	\$1.00 - \$2.50/hour
	\$300 - \$400/month
	\$3,500 - \$4,500/year
Short Day	\$5.00/hour
	\$200 - \$380/month for half days
	\$3,000 - \$4,000/year for half days*

---

*Information supplied by licensing agency.

Thus, a teacher can make almost the same salary working three hours a day with long vacations as she can working ten hours a day with virtually no vacations.

The long day setting attracts personnel for one of two reasons. The middle class status associated with being a teacher is a powerful source of attraction for women whose main alternative is to clerk in a store or work in a factory. These women usually have no training beyond high school and fill positions as assistant teachers in day care centers. The other attraction is the opportunity to be doing essential service. Some of the teachers who worked in private short day schools described themselves as frustrated and feeling useless in their jobs. They disliked giving a non-essential service to children who didn't need them. Therefore, some dedicated, well trained professionals, who could work anywhere they choose, take positions in a day care center, because of their desire to feel useful.

Teachers in long day schools derive their main source of satisfaction from their relationship with the children, which is intrinsic to the job. Teachers in short day schools, on the other hand, are more attracted by the convenience of the hours and the financial return. Teaching has always attracted women because of its complementarily to their role as wife and mother (Caplow, 1954). This factor is even more important in preschools. Many of the teachers who work in short day schools work only the morning or the afternoon session. Thus they can earn slightly more than if they did substitute teaching in elementary schools and they can be home at functionally crucial times of the day, such as meal hours, after school, and so forth.

Therefore the main sources of satisfaction are extrinsic to the work itself. This distinction is related to the difference between the more expressive teacher-child relationship in the long day schools and the more instrumental bond in short day schools (see proposition 5).

The difference in motivation is further supported by data on commitment to preschool teaching. All teachers who were interviewed for the observational study were asked the following questions:

1. What do you expect to be doing five years from now?
2. If you had complete freedom to choose, what kind of a job or position would you most like to have some day?
3. Under what circumstances, if any, would you stop being a preschool teacher?

If they clearly indicated that they wanted and expected to continue with preschool teaching in the future, they were defined as _positive_ in their commitment. If they were not sure about what they wanted or expected to do, they were classified as _uncertain_, and if they had plans or preferences for other types of employment, they were defined as _negative_. The results are given in Table 1. It can be seen that virtually all teachers in day care centers (8 out of 9) were postively committed to preschool teaching whereas only half of the teachers in short day schools were so committed.

The lower level of commitment of teachers in short day schools reflects the fact that to some this was just a convenient job. If a different kind of job became available that offered greater attractions they would not hesitate to leave the field. Some of the teachers described the job as an interim solution because their own children were young and they needed to spend as much time at home as possible.

TABLE 1

COMMITMENT TO PRESCHOOL TEACHING BY WORK SETTING

Work Setting	Commitment to Preschool Teaching Positive	Uncertain	Negative	Total
Long Day	8	1	0	9
Short Day	6	3	3	12
Total	14	4	3	21

TABLE 2

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY WORK SETTING

Work Setting	Educational Attainment B.A. or More	Less than B.A.	Total
Long Day	3	6	9
Short Day	6	6	12
Total	9	12	21

Teaching in short day schools usually needs more educational credentials than teaching in long day schools. Most head teachers in private nursery schools are required to have completed at least a B.A. degree and directors are often expected to have attained an M.A. as well. By contrast, in day care centers the maximum required is two years of college for one of the staff members, usually the director (Illinois State Standards). Most of the teachers who were working in short day schools with less than a B.A. degree were the indigenous personnel of the Head Start centers. Table 2 shoes the relationship between educational attainment and work setting of this group of teachers. It is clear that most of the teachers who had completed college or gone beyond were working in short day schools. The findings concerning motivation and educational background of short day teachers support the data reported by Jones (1963) for California nursery school teachers.

The higher educational level of short day preschool teachers reflects the occupational prestige of the two types of work settings. Day care centers have traditionally ranked lower than nursery "schools." Some of the professionally trained preschool teachers still refer to day care center staff as "just baby sitters." This situation is changing as a result of the increasing interest in the preschool years of life and the concommitant professionalization of preschool teachers, but the old images persist within the profession and especially in society at large.

In summary, one of the implications of length of day is that long day schools attract a different type of staff than short day schools. Long day staff are less highly trained but more highly committed to their work because of intrinsic sources of satisfaction. In contrast, teachers in short day schools tend to be more highly trained but less committed to the work because their main sources of satisfaction are extrinsic to the work itself.

Implications of Client Socioeconomic Status

As we pointed out in the last chapter the term low socioeconomic status client groups will be used to refer to persons who are eligible for subsidized preschool services. High socioeconomic status includes all other client groups. Low socioeconomic status groups contain a large fraction of what are usually referred to as the "underprivileged," the "disadvantaged," or the "deprived."

It is also well to note that the main ethnic group included in the study was American Negro. The analysis might have been different had the study included a large fraction of American Indians, American hillbillies, or Mexican-Americans. For instance, as Deutsch (1968, p. 49) points out, one of the major problems for a rural population like the American Indian, when it is transplanted to an urban setting, is to alter its work tempo to meet time limitations. This would not present the same type of difficulties for American Negro children who were born and raised in urban areas. The skills and limitations of a low socioeconomic status American Indian or Mexican-American population might differ in important respects from the skills and limitations of a low socioeconomic status American Negro population. Furthermore, the Negro population is to be found disproportionately in the low socioeconomic status groups. The high socioeconomic status schools have a much lower proportion of Negroes than low socioeconomic status schools.

Thus, the analysis presented here cannot separate out the effects of race and socioeconomic status variables. This is unavoidable since the unit of analysis of this study is the clientele of a given type of preschool, not a given child or group of children.

The socialization process at schools that served different client populations was different in a number of aspects that can be related to the particular skills and deficiencies of their client groups. In the last chapter we discussed the relationship of socioeconomic status and school achievement. This section will document some of the assumptions and propositions set out previously with material from the observational study. For instance, as Reissman (1962) pointed out, low socioeconomic status children are more skillful in some areas than their high socioeconomic status counterparts. The observations indicate that among low socioeconomic status children those who were verbal displayed considerable knowledge of subjects such as boyfriends, sexual matters, jails, and so forth, which did not enter the conversational exchanges of high socioeconomic status children. The speech of low socioeconomic status children were liberally punctuated with "bull shits," "fuck yous," and other expressions which were foreign to high socioeconomic children of that age. However, these abilities were regarded as problems rather than as assets by their middle class teachers. Several teachers said they were concerned about the foul language that they heard the children use. They spent much time and effort teaching the children "how to talk properly."

The low socioeconomic status child is also able to do without many things that high socioeconomic status children regard as necessary. For instance, low socioeconomic status children were able to amuse themselves with virtually no playthings. A stick, a handful of stones, seemed adequate to keep them occupied. They seldom complained as high socioeconomic status children did that "there's nothing to do around here" or to be "bored" with the materials offered. Instead the children had to be encouraged to make use of the equipment. One of the major tasks of teachers was to show the children what to do with toys. For instance, a teacher was observed trying to interest a boy in building a structure out of tinker toys. All he wanted was to use one long rod as a gun. Another teacher who had worked with both kinds of children but was now teaching in a low socioeconomic status school said, "We've got pretty much the same kinds of equipment as the high socioeconomic status school but these kids just mess with the things. They don't get as much out of what we have. They enjoy themselves and have fun but that's not the same thing as learning."

Low socioeconomic status children are able to do without other things too. For instance, when the children got dressed to go outdoors, the high socioeconomic status children made much more effort to help with the dressing process but they also insisted that their clothes be properly fastened. A child who ran into trouble with zipping or buttoning would ask the teacher for help to get it done. The low socioeconomic status child would make much less effort to do the job himself but he would not seek help either. The children didn't seem to mind running around the playground in midwinter with their coats wide open and their hoods undone. Usually the teacher took the initiative to remedy the situation. "Johnny, you come here. You'll get cold if we don't fasten your jacket." "Go back inside and find your other mitten. You can't run around with bare hands in this weather."

Low socioeconomic status children also did not demand as much attention from adults. High socioeconomic status children enjoyed interacting with adults and would sometimes virtually pester them in their quest for attention, approval or for help with their projects. Low socioeconomic status children, on the other hand, shied away from adults. Several newcomers among low socioeconomic status children seemed to cower when a teacher approached them as though expecting to be harmed. Teachers of high socioeconomic status children are proud of the children's maturity when they are able to complete a job "all by themselves." On the other hand, a teacher of low socioeconomic children said that she felt that she had passed a major hurdle when she could approach a child and whisper in his ear. "Sometimes it takes months before they'll let you near them." This can pose a serious conflict with the need to instill discipline. For instance, one teacher said, "We've been told that these children are neglected and mistreated at home until it's coming out of our ears. They keep telling us to be kind to the children. But what can you do with a child that's tone-deaf to kindness. You try to talk to them nicely but they pay no attention until you yell at them. If you yell they become more frightened."

The ability of children to do without may be very functional for low socioeconomic status children in homes where adults have no time or patience with them and few toys are available. Their very self sufficiency, which under some circumstances is a positive characteristic, served, in this case, to constrict their effective environment. One kindergarten teacher described the difference as follows:

> When I ask a (mixed group of) children to tell me what a policeman does, the low socioeconomic status child usually tells me that he comes to the house to take you to jail. The high socioeconomic status child will also tell me that policemen make arrests. They all get that from television. But he will also know that a policeman directs traffic and helps people who get into trouble. In anything we discuss in class, the low socioeconomic status child knows less and when we try to describe an object the low socioeconomic status child notices fewer details.

One of the important functions of preschool education for low socioeconomic status children is to open them up to a greater range of experiences to stimulate their learning.

Another characteristic difference between low socioeconomic status and high socioeconomic status children is that the former are more liable to suffer from physical problems. One teacher in a low socioeconomic status school said that until the children have completed their health check she can never tell whether a child is not paying attention because he doesn't want to or because he doesn't hear well. Another teacher of low socioeconomic status children spoke of the number of children in her class who had suffered sufficiently severe physical problems during the past year to require hospitalization. Some of these were due to acute illnesses but a number represented neglected underlying conditions, e.g. orthopedic corrections, eye musculature surgery, etc.

Teachers of low socioeconomic status children are constantly alert to signs of lack of sleep or insufficient nourishment and plan their program with these concerns in mind. Among high socioeconomic status children, on the other hand, it is assumed that they receive adequate medical attention and that their normal needs are attended to at home. This difference also has implications for program planning.

In high socioeconomic status short day schools rest time is relatively flexible. The children are usually put down on their mats for a few minutes while the teacher plays a record but if they "seem full of the dickens" the rest time can be completely eliminated. In low socioeconomic status schools, on the other hand, rest time is considered a necessity because some children do not get sufficient rest at night.

A similar difference can be noted with regard to snacks. In high socioeconomic status short day schools, snack is regarded more as a diversion than as a necessity. For instance, in one private short day school there was a rule that if a child dropped his single cookie on the floor, he had to throw it in the garbage and was not offered another. In another school, if a child crumpled his plastic cup at snack time, he was denied a snack the next day. In low socioeconomic status schools snack time is regarded as essential nourishment. Teachers will use the opportunities presented by snack time to teach children good manners but they will not punish through deprivation of food. As one teacher said, "You never know how much they get to eat outside of what we give them. We know for a fact that some don't get breakfast before they come." Thus, the greater health problems and unmet physical needs of low socioeconomic status children are an important factor in program planning in these schools.

Another major difference between low and high socioeconomic status children is that on age graded scales, the former tend to place at less than age level. For instance, with respect to language, Gesell (1940) says that the 2 year speaks in single words, the 3 year old speaks in sentences and the 4 year old uses speech to obtain answers to his never ending questions. He describes the 4 year old as chattering constantly (pp. 43-49). This description fitted very well to the high socioeconomic status children but the low socioeconomic status children appeared younger by this criterion. Some of the low socioeconomic status children were barely able to articulate words at 3. The teachers said that a number of children were "non-verbal" when they entered the preschool programs. One of the most striking changes, according to the teachers, was in the amount of speech that children produced after they had gone through the program. In the observations of 3 and 4 year old low socioeconomic status children there are frequent examples of brief, highly condensed speech patterns, e.g. "Gimme" or "Gimme dat," "Don' shove," "Dat purty," etc.

One type of comparison can be made with regard to "Show and Tell" which is a popular activity at all preschools. Children bring something to school. It can be a toy or a tool or a book. It doesn't matter what it is but the children have to show the object to their classmates and tell them about it. In one high socioeconomic status school the children were so voluble that the teacher finally announced that she was going to limit the amount of time each child could spend on his presentation. In a low socioeconomic status school a teacher tried without much success to persuade the children to say anything at all about the objects that they had brought. If a child could say what it was he had brought, produce the label, he was highly praised.

Another important socioeconomic status difference can be seen in the manner of speaking. Whereas high socioeconomic status children spoke with well modulated voices, low socioeconomic status children either mumbled and spoke so softly that they were barely audible or they screeched and yelled. This difference may be related to the function of speech. As Bernstein (1960) pointed out, the restricted mode of speech that is characteristic of lower socioeconomic status persons serves a more expression function, whereas the elaborated speech of higher socioeconomic status groups has a more instrumental function.

A similar type of distinction can be seen with regard to motor characteristics. According to Gesell, the 3 year old still enjoys gross motor activity but engages in long periods of sedentary activity as well. The 4 year old, on the other hand, takes particular pleasure in feats of fine coordination. On this scale some of the 4 year old low socioeconomic status children barely achieved 3 year norms. One of the problems that teachers mentioned repeatedly was that low socioeconomic status children were too immature to enjoy "table toys," which is their euphemism for sedentary activity. These include puzzles, crayons, pegboards, scissors and paste, all of which require fine motor coordination. During "table toy" time, teachers in low socioeconomic status schools worked hard to interest the children in these activities. They often devoted much time to individual instruction, hoping to stimulate the children to become motivated in these new areas. However, as soon as the teacher was busy with another child, the one she had attended to previously would leave his table activity and gravitate to the large trucks, tricycles, climbing equipment, etc. One teacher who had worked with both low and high socioeconomic status children remarked that she used to struggle to teach low socioeconomic status children how to put together even the simplest puzzle. "Some of them never did catch on. With these (high socioeconomic status) children I've never yet had to teach a child how to do a puzzle. They all seem to know how when they get to school."

In the progression noted by Gesell from parallel to associative play the same pattern can be seen. For instance a group of high socioeconomic status 3 year old children were observed playing train on an indoor climbing structure. Among themselves and without the help from a teacher they decided on a division of labor, assigned roles, and jointly offered passenger service to their classmates and teachers. For almost a half hour they were engrossed in an elaborate, improvised game. Afterwards, the teacher remarked that this was not unusual. The children liked to develop their own games and preferred this to following a set of standard rules that emanate from the teacher. In contrast, the director of a low socioeconomic status school described their 3 year olds as "more like a herd." "You can't expect them to do much together until they're at least 4," was her comment. The low socioeconomic status children seemed more interested in objects than in people. The boys loved to lie on the floor with a truck "to make it go" while the girls liked to sit and hold a doll or try on a hat or a pair of high heeled shoes.

The same general point can be made in respect to other areas of functioning and it has been noted by various authors who have worked with groups of disadvantaged children. For instance, Riley and Epps (1967) gave a battery of pre-post tests to a group of summer Head Start children. The children were 4 years 7 months old or older. The authors defined a child as severely limited if he tested below 3 years of age on the age graded tests. By this standard 60 of their 89 children were severely limited. They reported that 36 children suffered from a severely restricted vocabulary; 28 suffered from social deprivation, which they defined as not knowing how to interact with people, and 29 were described as suffering from social maladjustment. This last category was not meant in the psychological sense but rather related to the children's distrust of adults.

Because of the differences in developmental norms, the educational experience in low socioeconomic status and high socioeconomic status schools was different even though teachers had essentially similar goals. These goals are a product of the teachers' training and orientation which, as we noted previously, are based on middle class norms. For instance, teachers in both types of schools plan lessons around teaching "concepts," e.g. number concepts, direction concepts, etc. In a high socioeconomic status school the teacher could move relatively smoothly through such a lesson plan in the allotted time period. In low socioeconomic status schools teachers were continually frustrated in these goals. For instance, a group of low socioeconomic status children were studying pets. The teacher had planned to bring in mathematical concepts by discussing the number of legs of different animals. She had also planned to move into the distinction between inner and outer by talking about body coverings and body organs. However, the children could not distinguish between the number of legs of a chicken and a dog even though pictures of the animals were available. They could not make any response to the teacher's questions about body covering. When the teacher told them the answer to one of her questions, they repeated it mechanically but could not abstract from the information to relate it to a different class of objects. Besides, the children lost interest and started to squirm almost immediately after the lesson began. The teacher was repeatedly forced to stop to discipline the children and regain their attention. As a result, she lost the interest of even those children who had initially shown some enthusiasm. This incident may show how these problems are all interrelated. The children lack experience with the wider environment. They lack verbal comprehension and the ability to use language as a "mediating" tool, as Jensen (1965) says. They also lack motivation and social skills which are necessary for learning. The deficiencies of low socioeconomic status children are not only interrelated but also cumulative. For instance, these children have considerable difficulty with fine motor coordination. Therefore, they cannot be motivated as easily to engage in the cutting and pasting activities that teachers like to use to teach concepts of shape and size. When such activities are introduced, the children become restless and their potential for learning the new ideas is decreased.

In summary, low socioeconomic status children differ from high socioeconomic status children in their position on developmental norms, in their attitude to adults and in their receptivity to experiences that are available in the preschool environment. Also, low socioeconomic status children are more prone to physical problems than high socioeconomic status children, which also affected the socialization process. Thus, although teachers in both types of schools had essentially similar goals, they could not carry through the same kind of program. This factor was a constant source of frustration to the teachers. One of the main differences between high and low socioeconomic status schools is that in the former there is a congruence between what the teacher has learned, what she wants to do, and what she is able to accomplish. In the low socioeconomic status schools the teacher is not able to apply what she has learned because her education has been predicated on the abilities and capacities of middle class children.

CHAPTER V

THE TYPOLOGY

A four fold typology results when the two dimensions are combined as in the following figure:

Figure 1. Types of Preschool Institutions

Length of Day	Socioeconomic Status of Client Group Low	High
Long	I. Subsidized Day Care Centers	III. Private Day Care Centers
Short	II. Compensatory Education	IV. Private Nursery Schools

It will be apparent that each cell contains one important type of preschool institution to which reference has already been made. This typology, with the cells numbered as above, will be used throughout the remainder of this report. This chapter will begin with a brief review of the literature on the four types. The next section will summarize the skills that are part of the educational process of the preschools and that have an important bearing on school achievement. The last section will show which types of skills are learned at which types of schools. This analysis will lead to a statement of the central hypothesis of the study, which was tested statistically after the observational study had been completed.

Review of the Literature

Cell I and III

These two cells need to be treated together because the authors of these studies have generally not distinguished the institutions by the socioeconomic status of their client group. The main studies by Prescott (1965 and 1959), Prescott and Jones (1967) and Jones (1963) deal with the effect of the environment of a day care center on the fulfillment of a child's basic needs. The authors focus on the developmental tasks of children at that age and analyze the educational process in terms of which of these tasks were facilitated by the institution. They conclude that the day care center offered the children good physical care, stability of routines, consistency in discipline and the opportunity to master a variety of social skills, especially in interaction with other children. Further, they conclude that for most children the day care center offered more learning experiences than the children had at home, especially because of the variety of equipment. On the other hand, they point out that day care centers do not give children the opportunity to be private. Furthermore, the children's experience with the adult world is restricted because in the day care centers the children lack normal community contacts, especially contacts with men. Their final point is that in a day care center children lack the opportunity to test the limits of their skill because the overriding concern with safety precludes experimentation with unorthodox and perhaps dangerous uses of equipment. The Kitano (1963) study of a day care center in no way contradicts these statements.

Prescott and Jones also concern themselves with selectivity of staff, showing that staff at day care centers and nursery schools differ somewhat in their demographic characteristics and in their education and training. They show that the major concerns of staff vary with the work setting. Thus, the director of privately owned nursery school asked for further training in the use of materials and in planning activities, whereas the directors of parent cooperatives stressed their need for help in administration.

The only study which related day care center attendance with elementary school achievement was one carried out by Wolff and Stein in New York City in 1966. The authors traced down 101 third, fourth and fifth graders who had attended day care centers in neighborhoods also served by Head Start programs. These children were compared on standardized reading achievement tests with their classmates. The difficulty of this undertaking can be seen in the fact that to evaluate the performance of 101 children, they needed to compare them with over 3,000 classmates. Cell I children are a rare element indeed! The authors draw very tentative conclusions from their findings because of the various limitations of their study design, e.g. they had no information on preschool experiences of the 3,000 plus control group; some of the tests were administered at the beginning of the school year whereas others were given at the end of the year, etc. Nevertheless, they found that day care children performed better than control group children. In terms of grade norms, 23% of the day care children scored at or above grade level compared with 14% of the control group. Thus the only evidence on the relationship between attendance at cell I institutions and school achievement shows a positive correlation.

The literature in these two cells points to the value of long day schools in training social skills. The Prescott and Jones studies also emphasize the shortcomings of long day schools for the development of children. However, they present no empirical evidence to support their assertions. To the contrary, J. Swift (1964) who attempted a systematic summary of the effects of early group experience in both short and long day institutions concluded that "there is . . . no evidence that children receiving nonresidential group care have been negatively affected in their development or adjustment as a result of the experience" (p. 258).

Cell II

This type of preschool has been extensively studied. The studies are descriptive as well as evaluative. Some of the most interesting are those that contain comparisons within the cell. For instance, Weikart (1967) organized three different types of preschool programs and Karnes _et al_. (1969) report results on five different types of programs. These comparison projects usually contain a traditional type program which serves as a control to highlight the effects of more experimental type programs, which are structured to meet specific needs of the population rather than general enrichment. Other authors innovate by focusing on younger age children (Gray _et al_., 1968) or by using an indirect educational design, i.e. the authors train the parents who train the children (Karnes, 1969). Still another approach has been to integrate low socioeconomic status with high socioeconomic status children (Lenrow, 1968; Karnes, 1969). The results of the integrated programs seem to indicate that the disadvantaged child population do not gain a great deal from their association with more advantaged peers. This is in line with the conviction of Bereiter (1966) that low socioeconomic status children have special needs which the traditional type middle class nursery school program does not meet.

The Westinghouse report (Cicarelli, 1969) presents a summary of these studies. The authors conclude that the majority of the studies are "limited in scope and weak in design." (p. 15) The Westinghouse study itself is extensive in scope and very carefully conceived. The authors compare a large, carefully selected sample of first, second, and third grade Head Start children with an equal number of first, second, and third grade non-Head Start children from 100 centers around the country. The Head Start and non-Head Start population are matched on a variety of variables such as sex, race, kindergarten attendance, family size, language spoken at home, and parental occupation. Further, the authors statistically control for the remaining socioeconomic status differences. For their quantitative analysis the authors restrict themselves to standardized achievement tests. Their overall results do not show a dramatic difference between the two groups. However, when they break down their data they show clearly that the compensatory education programs were most effective where the need was presumably the greatest, i.e. in the South, in predominantly Negro centers, and in "core" areas of cities. Children in those 3 categories are most likely to suffer from severe school related deficiencies. The authors also note that the study does not do justice to some of the other contributions of Head Start programs. For instance, Head Start has been very effective in remedying nutritional and medical problems of children. The authors also mention that one of the bi-products of Head Start has been an increase in the children's social competence. The authors point to the education of parents and to the parents' general satisfaction with the program as further contributions. The last two points bear further investigation before they can be accepted with confidence.

The cell II studies lead to two types of conclusions. First, compensatory education seems to be most effective where need is greatest. This is a very positive finding and one that has not been sufficiently recognized. The second conclusion, that comes through clearly in the work of Weikart (1967), Bereiter (1967), Karnes (1969), and others, is that programs are most successful when they are designed to be congruent with the known educationally related deficiencies of the client group. However, one of the differences between this study and the authors mentioned is that the latter focus almost exclusively on the cognitive deficiencies of low socioeconomic status children. This study emphasizes other type of deficiencies as well, e.g. social skills, interactional skills and motivational skills (see proposition 8). All the evidence points to the conclusion that compensatory programs are less successful when they copy the traditional programs that were designed to serve a high socioeconomic status client group.

Cell IV

There is a large volume of literature on cell IV type schools, much of it descriptive or prescriptive. Each special type has its own literature, i.e. the Montessori schools have a lengthy bibliography dealing with their principles, tools and techniques (Rambush, 1962). The parent cooperatives have likewise been studied as a special type (Taylor, 1954). Reviews of the literature are presented for instance by M. Fuller (1960), and Swift (1964). These authors conclude that attendance at such schools is certainly not harmful in any way. However, the evidence is inconclusive as to whether they are generally helpful. For children with special handicaps they clearly make a positive contribution. For instance, Kirk (1958) in his study of the effects of early education for mentally retarded children showed that the children gained substantially as a result of preschool education.

Thus, the economically and socially disadvantaged are not the only groups to benefit from preschool programs. Children who function at a lower level of competence than the normal middle class child population for any reason seem to gain as a result of such programs. However, it is hardly surprising that these studies present little evidence that normal middle class children make great gains as a result of such programs. As we have pointed out in Chapter III (proposition 11), these children are well equipped to cope with school and other life problems without additional training. Perhaps it might be useful to ask what role the nursery school is supposed to play in the life of the middle class child. Perhaps it is not designed to serve an educational function.

This review of the literature indicates that preschools are relatively most effective where the need is greatest. Second, it suggests that preschool programs are most effective when they are structured to meet the specific needs that brought the children to the programs. The literature presents little evidence on the comparative effectiveness of long day and short day programs on different client populations. The current study is designed to fill this function.

School Related Skills

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the contribution of each type of preschool to the learning of skills that relate to school achievement. This study will focus on four types of skills, cognitive skills, social skills, learning process or motivational skills, and interactional skills. These skills are by no means independent entities but for the purposes of this analysis it may be useful to treat them as though they were.

Cognitive skills have always been regarded as crucial to school achievement. Hess and Shipman (1968), for instance, define educability as a compositive of three attributes, the first of which is cognitive skills. This general category includes first and foremost language skills, whose importance has been clearly established by Bernstein (1960), Bereiter (1966) and others. A child needs to be able to understand the communications of others and to make himself understood to them. In this sense, language skills are fundamental to interactional skills, which will be discussed below.

The child needs to be able to manipulate words, to deal with phrases, to manipulate their components and to construct new word combinations. The significance of these skills has been underscored in Bereiter's discussion of "giant words." (1966) Giant words are combinations that are treated as wholes. A child who uses these word-phrases cannot manipulate their components. He cannot create new phrases out of constituents of old phrases and thus he cannot think logically to arrive at new inferences. Jensen (1965) has pointed out the role of language in concept formation through verbal mediation, the latter is defined as verbal behavior which facilitates further learning and which permits conceptual thinking.

Second, a child needs a basic fund of information concerning both his immediate environment and the world beyond. He needs to know the names of objects and processes. Also, he needs to be familiar with abstract concepts, such as those concerning directions, colors, numbers and so forth. The labeling process, especially in relation to abstract concepts is basic to Bernstein's analysis of the importance of elaborated rather than restricted language modes. A child who uses restricted language cannot deal with abstractions. The language modes, in turn, influence perception and determine a child's receptivity to environmental stimuli. Third, a child needs to know how to use a large variety of materials, such as scissors, pencils, books, clocks, and so forth. This discussion should indicate that a child who lacks cognitive skills will inevitably suffer in his ability to achieve in school.

The importance of social skills has perhaps been demonstrated most clearly in the work of Deutsch and his associates. In one of his studies, Deutsch found that the proportion of school time devoted to non-academic tasks, mainly disciplining the children, was between 50% and 80% in a lower class Negro school. In the lower class White school that he used as a control, the proportion of time devoted to these tasks was between 30% and 50% (Deutsch, 1960, p. 23). Thus, about half the total school time was devoted to problems related to social skills. This showed that the children's lack of social skills, which can be seen in the amount of school time devoted to discipline, led to a curtailment of the learning process because less time was available for academic training.

The importance of learning to sit still and to pay attention is also implicit in the work of Gray et al. (1966). As these authors point out, children who have not developed requisite inner controls cannot produce the types of social behaviors that are functional in school. Deutsch (1963) also makes the point that low socioeconomic status children lack the experience of focusing and attending which contribute to the children's frustration with their school experiences (p. 4). Of course, these skills should not be separated from motivational skills. Children may fail to sit still and pay attention because they cannot be interested in the content of school work. However, this can also become part of a vicious cycle. A child may fail to become interested because he cannot pay attention long enough to find out what the school has to offer and to teach.

This general category can be subdivided again into formal and informal social skills. Formal social skills are those taught more or less expressly by the school. These include the ability to follow school rules, e.g. to form an orderly line at dismissal time, to raise your hand when you want to speak, etc. The ability to listen to an adult, to follow directions, and to sit still are equally important. These also include middle class rules of behavior, e.g. rules of politeness, rules of priority (first come first served), etc. These include the ability to subordinate one's wishes to that of the group. They also include the ability to accept the authority of the teacher and to interpret a teacher's cues, including indirect ones, e.g., "We need to have everyone sing this song" as equivalent to the command, "Sing." The ability to accept the authority of the teacher has been singled out by Hess and Shipman as one of the three main components of educability (1968, p. 95).

Informal social skills are generally not taught by the school but they are learned by the children in their efforts to get along in the educational system. One of these skills is to distinguish prescribed, preferred and proscribed rules. Children are quite confused until they learn the difference between what they are told they should and should not do and what they will be punished for doing or not doing. A closely related skill is to recognize unspoken cues. Most students discover that enforcement of rules varies with the mood of the teacher and they become adept at recognizing when she has a headache and when she "feels like joining in some fun." In a similar vein, children learn that for some teachers "creative writing" means accuracy in spelling, grammar, and punctuation. They also need to learn what substitutions will be acceptable, i.e. neatness often distracts attention from mistakes and courtesy can substitute for knowledge. Also, children need to learn to be patient while waiting for a busy teacher. Going to school requires the ability to tolerate a certain amount of boredom.

It should be noted that the informal social skills are functional not only for the smooth operation of the social system of the school but they have important uses in other settings as well, such as work settings and the home, In the sense that schools as socializing agencies attempt to prepare the child for his future roles, their "teaching" of these skills can be interpreted as a positive contribution.

The importance of motivational skills is central to the work of Reissman (1962). As he points out, the disadvantaged child does not succeed in school because he cannot be motivated to achieve because the content of school work has little relevance to his life. Fowler (1968) has related school achievement to an optimistic approach to new experiences and new tasks. This position has been corroborated in the word of Zeaman and House (1963). These authors have shown how "failure set" or the expectation of failure can serve as a self fulfilling prophesy. The child who expects failure cannot be motivated to try, especially when the task is difficult. Toby (1957) has shown how the ability to be motivated depends on interaction with others in the child's environment. The child's main stimulus for becoming motivated comes from his significant others who may or may not reinforce his school efforts (see proposition 5). If they do not care what he learns or whether he tries, he cannot be expected to make the effort that is required for school success.

Learning process skills include two types. A child needs to be able to learn in response to external stimulation. This means that he will respond appropriately while under a teacher's supervision. Most typically, this involves learning through drill, through forced recitation by being called on in class, etc. The other type involves learning in response to internal stimulation. This includes the ability to work without constant teacher supervision because of a desire to master new material. Children who are able to do this can be described as having a strong achievement motivation (McClelland, 1953). In keeping with the currently fashionable principles of progressive education, teachers prefer learning of the latter type. However, in reality, most learning is probably of the first type, especially in the case of low socio-economic status children. Appropriate teaching techniques are quite different for the two types of learning processes but basic information can probably be transmitted as effectively in one way as in the other.

Interactional skills involve the child's ability to deal correctly with both adults and peers. In order to function adequately as a student, a child must learn to interact with adults in areas that are unrelated to meeting his immediate physiological and emotional needs. The child must learn to differentiate between the diffuse, affective, expressive maternal role and the specific, neutral, instrumental teacher role. Thus, the child needs to learn how to approach an adult and what are appropriate content for teacher-student interactions. In other words he must learn to use adults to promote learning.

Deutsch (1967, p. 50) has pointed out that children who live in crowded homes where adults have little time or interest in interaction, do not learn how to ask questions. However, the ability to ask questions is essential for data gathering, which, in turn, is necessary for concept formulation and other types of learning. Beiling (1967) has pointed out that the lower class child does not expect to learn through interaction. Instead he expects that interaction will lead to coercion into some activity or lack of activity desired by the adult. This, of course, relates to the disadvantaged child's tendency to distrust adults, which has been noted by Riley et al. (1967) in their observations and testing of Head Start children.

The child must also learn to interact with peers within school dictated rules of decorum. Most specifically, this means control over his aggressive impulses during school hours. Therefore, this skill is closely related to the social skills discussed previously. However, children are also expected to participate in group activities.

Consequently, simple avoidance of interaction is not considered adequate by the school.

The purpose of this section was to show the importance of cognitive skills, social skills, motivational skills and interactional skills for school achievement. Using these skills as a guide, we will now consider the four types of preschools to analyze the contribution of each type of school achievement. For the sake of clarity, this section will conclude with a figure that will present the information in summarized form.

Educational Contributions of Types of Preschools

Cell I. The Subsidized Day Care Center

Probably the most important contribution of subsidized day care centers is in the teaching of school related social skills (propositions 3 and 6). This comes through clearly in a comparison of new entrants with students who have attended the previous year. A large fraction of children attend these schools for two years. Much time during the first year is devoted to obedience training. For instance during a half hour story period the teacher stopped her reading a half dozen times to lead the children in a finger exercise that was supposed to help them to keep their hands still and a deep breathing exercise designed to help the children relax and concentrate on the group activity. The teacher explained that she had developed this technique because "You first have to teach the children how to pay attention before you can teach them to enjoy a story." The teacher was probably quite right in her analysis because the children did not object to the interruptions. They also did not seem bored with the repetition. To the contrary, they seemed to enjoy learning the rhythmic movements and repeated them each time with great gusto.

The older children show considerable mastery of formal social skills. For instance, a four year old group at the same school was given the following set of instructions: "Get a sheet of paper and a pencil and take a leaf from the pile on the table. Put the leaf under your sheet of paper. Then rub your pencil lightly over the paper and you will see the leaf come through." This group of children had never attempted a similar task. A few succeeded reasonably well without any further instructions. Others managed with some additional help. Several were totally unable to follow through and made only a token effort. This senior group of children showed adequate ability to follow a complex set of instructions such as they might have been given at school.

In this type of setting, children also learn informal social skills, especially how to manipulate the system for their own ends and how to substitute postural conformity for psychological involvement. This happens particularly in two types of situations. It happens when children cannot be motivated to learn. These are usually the "immature" children, so called because "they just want to play all the time." It also happens when children who are considerably advanced in school skills are included in the program. For instance, children of graduate students are a prime example. They are eligible because of low income but they are much more sophisticated than the majority group. These children are bored by activities that are appropriate for the other children. Accordingly, they use their talents in discovering how to manipulate the system. Teachers described these children as "too bright to be here." They felt that it wasn't fair to the other children to include them in the program and complained that the more sophisticated children were always up to some mischief or other.

In terms of cognitive skills, it is important to distinguish between conscious, planned teaching and learning. The observational material suggests that a great deal of cognitive learning was going on even though some institutions did not schedule formal lessons (see proposition 2). Some schools set aside periods for academic type lessons but even there, most of the learning probably takes place at other times. For instance, because of the long school day, children usually have a relatively free play period soon after they arrive and at the end of the school day. At these times, children have an opportunity to experiment at their leisure with various materials, with scissors and paste, with crayons, with blocks, books, puzzles, and so forth. Also, at these times, adults are relatively less rushed because not all the children are present and because the teachers are not scheduled for formal teaching. Accordingly, teachers spend such free time giving individual attention to the children, explaining, and teaching children how to communicate, which is much more difficult to do in a group situation. As a matter of fact, for acquiring language skills, children probably learn more from listening to adults speak all day than from any formal language lessons.

In terms of motivational skills, these children are given good training in responding to external stimulation (see proposition 5).

Children are taught a great deal by rote, through group repetition of whatever the teacher says. In this way, they learn the alphabet, names of colors, names of various objects, and so forth.

In subsidized day care centers children acquire considerable skill in interaction with others. Probably the most important thing they learn is to trust adults. Their original mistrust becomes a strong affectual bond, which the teacher reciprocates. These children may not learn to differentiate the maternal from the teacher role, and the maternal type relationship is probably not readily transferable to the elementary school situation. However, it is not clear whether or not this factor constitutes an important problem. The observational material suggests that children did not find it difficult to develop an instrumental relationship with teachers in short day schools. It may be that this particular interactional skill is relatively easy to learn. Under those circumstances, low socioeconomic status children may stand to gain more in the long run by an affective relationship with a teacher, such as they develop in long day schools than from an instrumental type relationship which is more characteristic of short day schools (see proposition 5).

Children do learn acceptable interaction patterns with peers. One of the most dramatic differences between old and new students is the tendency for newcomers to settle differences of opinion with their fists, whereas the old timers engage in noisy arguments without resorting to force.

In summary, although the most obvious contribution of this type of preschool is in the teaching of social skills, this is not the only type of skill taught. Subsidized day care centers also teach children cognitive skills of all kinds. The children are taught to learn in response to external stimulation. The children also learn to trust adults, but they tend to develop an expressive relationship with their preschool teachers which cannot easily be transferred to the elementary school situation.

Cell II. Compensatory Education

The major contribution of these programs is probably in the area of cognitive skills, regardless of program design. If the format leans heavily on play and creative expression, the children learn to use materials and learn the names of objects and concepts such as colors and numbers as a biproduct. If the program is academically focused, the children may get more information about the subjects taught but then learn less about the use of materials and other types of cognitive skills. Because these programs are limited by the total length of time allotted to them, it is impossible to maximize all types of learning simultaneously. It is difficult to tell how much difference in amount of learning actually occurs in different types of programs because evaluation procedures are always selective and tend to emphasize the specific kinds of information that are stressed in a given program.

Because of the strong cognitive focus of these programs and the time restriction, there is much less emphasis on training in social skills (see proposition 6). Teaching social skills requires much time and effort. In these cognitively oriented programs the only social skills usually taught are those that are needed to carry out the primary goal. For instance, in one of the most concentrated academic programs, teachers are trained to control the behavior of the children without calling attention to the process. In these teaching sessions, one adult handles no more than five or six children in a small, bare cubicle that contains a minimum of distraction. The instructor handles the lesson material with one hand and with the other literally keeps the children sitting in their chairs. The program originators believe that teaching social skills is a waste of precious time for children who have so much else to learn.

The compensatory education programs also teach motivational skills. These children are taught to learn in response to external stimuli. Since the emphasis here is on maximizing cognitive skills and since it is easiest to transmit information through external stimulation, this is virtually the only method used.

The problem with this type of program is that the children do not acquire school related social skills (see proposition 9). Whereas in an experimental, university operated preschool program the teaching of social skills can be avoided by using a low child-staff ratio (see preposition 3), such a format is not possible in the typical elementary school. A public school teacher alone in a classroom of 25 to 45 children cannot possibly supervise all the children all the time and cannot physically control the children. She must depend on their ability to behave in an acceptable manner and on their ability to learn the required material without an adult constantly standing over them. If the children have not learned these skills previously, she is forced to spend a large fraction of school time in disciplining the children or "civilizing" them, as some of the teachers put it. It would be interesting to find out just how well children are able to transfer skills learned in a highly atypical, academically concentrated, university designed experimental preschool setting to a normal elementary school situation.

On the other hand, children probably acquire appropriate interactional skills with adults in these programs. They learn to treat teachers interchangeably, as symbols of authority. They also learn that adults do not want to harm children and that adults can serve as a useful source of information. Thus they learn to develop an instrumental type relationship with their teachers.

These children are not as well trained in interactional skills with peers. The children engage in a great deal more physical aggression, i.e. pushing, kicking, fighting, etc. than would be acceptable in a school situation. These results are readily understandable because of the lack of time available for training the children in all the skills they need to overcome their initial, school related deficiencies.

In summary, the major contribution of cell II schools is in teaching cognitive skills, regardless of program design. The children fail to learn adequate social skills. They learn to acquire information in response to external stimulation and to develop an instrumental relationship with their teachers.

Cell III. The Private Day Care Center

As was pointed out in the last two chapters, children of high socioeconomic status schools are well trained in school related skills before they even enter preschools (see proposition 11). Therefore, although a high level of social behavior is expected of all children in private day care centers, such skills are not explicitly taught. Children occasionally need to be "reminded" when they "forget" how to behave but they very seldom need to be punished for deviance. As one teacher explained, "You certainly never need to punish a child more than once for the same kind of infraction."

Learning of informal social skills is usually a result of boredom. It seems to happen when bright children are subjected to an unimaginative program that does not tax their faculties. Partly to avoid this and also to keep the children occupied, these schools often provide a high level of cognitive training. This is relatively easy for the teachers to carry out. It is far easier to give the children large quantities of factual information out of the adult's greater store of knowledge than to occupy the children with "creative" types of activities. Also, it is easier to acquire the necessary materials for teaching cognitive skills. Weekly Readers are cheap and centers can subscribe and use a grade level reader that is congruent with the ability level of the client group. A class of three year olds was observed using first grade Readers. If the material is a little difficult and requires more time to master, this helps to keep the children occupied longer and is therefore welcomed by the staff.

In terms of motivational skills, these children are highly motivated to perform. Their desire for mastery is quite high, so much so that they tend to prod the teachers rather than the reverse. These children are always eager to try something new and feel quite free to ask questions. The teachers, on the other hand, were sometimes concerned about their inability to answer the children's questions.

On the other hand, they were also reluctant to admit their ignorance for fear of losing authority over the children.

These children probably learned little in interactional skills through their attendance at the center. The children are outgoing and eager for opportunities to interact with both children and adults when they enter the setting. However, they probably do not learn to develop an instrumental relationship with the teacher because of the strong affectual bond that ties the children and the teachers at a day care center.

The main contribution of private day care centers is in training cognitive skills at an advanced level. The children received cognitive training at a level that is far in excess of what is expected of a student entering elementary school. In these settings the children probably learn some social skills depending on their previous training in this area. Since these settings demand a high level of social control the amount of learning varies depending on the level of expectation of the child's family. Children who are "spoiled" at home gain more than those who are strictly disciplined. The children learn little in motivational skills and their relationships with teachers are too expressive to permit easy transfer to such interactional skills to the elementary school setting.

Cell IV. Private Nursery Schools

Of the four types, this one probably serves the most sophisticated group of children. Their parents are frequently engaged in professional type occupations requiring a very high level of educational attainment. Also, these parents have the time and take pleasure in teaching the children cognitive skills. Therefore, they often insist that teachers not emphasize these areas at school. Parents know that their children are more than adequately prepared in cognitive skills to enter school. They fear that further training in these areas will be dysfunctional for the children's later adjustment in elementary school. Therefore, cognitive skills are advanced in these schools only indirectly. Generally the child teaches himself, as he manipulates the variety of materials that are available in this setting.

Teaching social skills involves some very thorny problems in private nursery schools. Many, probably a majority of the children, have acquired adequate social skills before they enter school. However, teachers are so constrained by parents in the area of discipline that they are not able to teach social skills to those children who need such training (see proposition 4). Children who suffer from this type of deficiency do not gain school related social skills in these pre-schools. Their social training takes place after they have entered elementary school because parents have considerably less power to influence the course of events in the public schools than in a private nursery school. An elementary school teacher does not need to worry about her popularity with the client group, and she will be supported by the principal in her requirements concerning acceptable social behaviors.

In reference to motivational skills, these children are very adequately equipped with internal motivation. Rote learning is strongly disapproved of at these schools so that the thrust of the program is to stimulate these children to learn because of their intrinsic interest in the material and because of their desire to master new skills.

In terms of relational skills, these children seem to learn without any apparent difficulty to develop an instrumental relationship with their teachers. Teachers are quite aware that to these children they are providers of "fun." Since the service is non-essential, teachers in this type of setting need to be quite concerned about their popularity rating with both the children and their parents.

The obvious problem in this setting is to offer anything of value beyond good custody. The issue of the mission of private nursery schools came up at one of the parents' meetings. The problem was, what kind of a unique service could this particular school offer in order to attract new clients. The most generally acceptable proposal was to offer a short school week. It was suggested that there might be a market for service to parents who preferred to send their children for two, three or four days a week instead of the traditional five. When the teacher was asked whether children who attended only a fraction of the time would not be at a disadvantage in terms of their ability to carry out the activities, she answered that the program of the school was so "flexible" that it didn't really matter how often the children came. Many of their current group of children attend erratically and do not seem to suffer thereby.

In summary these schools probably teach some instrumental interactional skills. It is very difficult for these schools to contribute substantially to the repertoire of skills of their client group for several reasons. First and foremost, the children are very well equipped with school related skills before they enter the setting (see proposition III). Second, the parents generally do not encourage these schools to further advance the cognitive skills of the children because they fear that such training may be dysfunctional for their children's future adjustment in elementary school. Third, parents do not give the teachers enough freedom to enable them to teach social skills to those children who need such training (see proposition 4).

The kinds of skills learned in different types of preschools will be summarized by means of a chart, as seen below. Parentheses are used to indicate that a specific factor is not of major importance.

Figure 2. Summary of Skills Learned in Different Types of Preschools

Cell I--Subsidized Day Care Centers	Cell III--Private Day Care Centers
Social Skills Cognitive Skills Motivational Skills Interactional Skills	Cognitive Skills (Some Social Skills)
Cell II--Compensatory Education	Cell IV--Private Nursery Schools
Cognitive Skills Interactional Skills Motivational Skills	(Some Interactional Skills)

To interpret this chart, several important points need to be kept in mind. First, it is apparent that cell I and cell II schools seem to be much more effective in terms of skills learned than cell III and cell IV schools. This should not be interpreted to imply that the former schools are of a higher quality than the latter. Instead, this effect must be related to our previous discussion of socioeconomic status differences in school related skills that children learn at home. Low socioeconomic status children do not learn these skills at home (see proposition 2). Therefore, they tend to learn them in the preschool context. High socioeconomic status children, on the other hand, learn these skills at home (see proposition 11). Therefore, they do not learn them in preschools. Accordingly, although many high socioeconomic status preschools offer excellent programs of various kinds, they nevertheless may not teach the children the basic skills that are necessary for success in elementary schools.

Also it must be reiterated that our discussion of low socioeconomic status children's skills and deficiencies are strictly limited to this context. As Reissman (1962) and others have pointed out, the low socioeconomic status child has a number of important skills that the high socioeconomic status child lacks. However, from the point of view of the elementary school as it is presently constituted, the low socioeconomic status child is not as able to perform the skills that lead to "success" in school as his high socioeconomic status counterpart.

The Central Hypothesis

The foregoing analysis of the functions of different kinds of preschool programs leads to the following hypothesis:

I. Children who attended subsidized day care centers (cell I) are more likely to meet the elementary school's criteria for adequate achievement than children who attended compensatory education programs (cell II). Put another way, among low socioeconomic status children attendance at long day rather than at short day schools will have an important effect on the outcome of the socialization process. The main reasons for this are the following:

1) Children from low socioeconomic status families are not adequately equipped with school related skills as a result of family socialization process (proposition 8).

2) Therefore, low socioeconomic status children need a preschool experience to prepare them for elementary school (proposition 9).

3) Long day schools in general provide more extensive socialization experiences than short day schools (proposition 1).

4) Long day schools emphasize training in social skills more than short day schools (propositions 3 and 6).

5) Long day schools provide more effective training than short day schools because teachers and children develop a diffuse, affective (significant-other-type) relationship in long day schools through which children learn motivational and interactional skills (proposition 5). Also, parents of children in long day schools do not exert effective counterpressures to the socialization process provided by the school (proposition 4).

II. Children who attended private day care centers (cell III) are about equally likely to meet the elementary school's criteria of adequate achievement as children who attended private nursery schools (cell IV). Put another way, among high socioeconomic status children attendance at long day rather than at short day schools will have little effect on the outcome of the socialization process. The main reason for this is the following:

Children from high socioeconomic status families are adequately equipped with school related skills as a result of family socialization process (proposition 11). Therefore they do not need a preschool experience to prepare them for school (proposition 12). As a result, the type of preschool they attend, or whether they attend at all, will have little relation to their school achievement (proposition 13).

The remainder of this report will be devoted to a statistical test of this hypothesis. The next chapter will deal with data collection and the following one will report on the findings.

CHAPTER VI

DATA COLLECTION

The central hypothesis of this study was tested through a statistical analysis of selected aspects of the scholastic achievement of children who had attended various types of preschools. In chapter II we noted that the statistical study was carried out in a different community than the observational study. This meant that the preschool institutions and the children included in the statistical study were totally different from those involved in the observational study. Consequently, it is impossible to draw direct connections between the observations and the statistical data. On the other hand, such a design offered certain advantages for this particular study. One of the problems in research on institutions is that they are extremely complex units. Therefore, the investigator usually either studies a very small sample of units thoroughly or a larger sample of units very selectively. In this study, since the bulk of the observations were carried out at only six institutions in a single locality, it seemed advisable to gain some impression of the generalizability of the findings. Accordingly, the deductions from the observations were tested in a different geographical context. Thus, when it became apparent that the statistical data supported the central hypothesis, it seemed more reasonable to suggest that the conclusions were not idiosyncratic to the organizations at which the observations were performed.

This chapter will begin with a discussion of the advantages and limitations of the research design that was employed in the statistical study. This will be followed by an analysis of the sample of subjects on whom data was collected. The final section of this chapter will involve a discussion of the measures of school achievement which were selected as the dependent variables.

Research Design

This study was planned as an analysis of an entire cohort of children in a single school system. The choice of a school system rather than a class or school as the unit of analysis was dictated by the following considerations. First, it was not known whether differences in school policy might not affect the comparability of achievement results of different groups of children. For instance, schools might well differ in their policies regarding promotion or retention of children. Second, since some of the results depended on teachers' judgments, we feared that personality and attitudinal differences between teachers might bias the results. We hoped that these two sources of bias could be avoided by using the school system as the unit of analysis.

The purpose of the study was to analyze the scholastic achievement of a cohort of children who had attended preschools during 1966-67 and had started kindergarten in the Fall of 1967. Thus, in the Fall of 1969, when the data was collected, the children had completed two years of school. The data for the study was taken from the children's cumulative school records at a single point in time. Since these results were used to extrapolate to the effects of the children's preschool experiences, the research design is clearly of the post hoc variety. Before going further, it is therefore appropriate to examine the advantages and disadvantages of such a design for the problems posed by this particular study.

The advantages of this particular design are two fold. First, this design seems uniquely appropriate in a situation where the purpose is to assess the outcome of a process that has taken place over time but where research funds and time are not available to study the entire process as it unfolds. The design would have been strengthened if some "pre" measures on the children had been available so that the outcome could have been measured in terms of pre-post differences instead of just in "post" scores. However, the "pre" measures did not exist so that this option was not available.

A second advantage of using a post hoc design in this situation was that the data collection did not depend on the long range recall of respondents. The unreliability of information that depends on respondent recall, especially for events that occurred in the distant past, is too well known to require extensive documentation (Selltiz, 1966). In the present case, information on the main independent variable, i.e. preschool attendance, was contained in the school records. This type of information was routinely recorded at the time of kindergarten registration, which is close to the time that the child had attended the preschool institution. Second, a limited check on the accuracy of the information was available. Both the subsidized day care centers (cell I) and the compensatory education programs (cell II) had maintained lists of all the children who had attended during the target year. These lists were used to supplement the school information.

Nevertheless, this type of design is subject to two types of major limitations, those relating to selectivity and those relating to mortality (Campbell, 1963). Actually, when we deal with the problems of selectivity, we need to consider two major types. One group of factors concerns selectivity within the sample population. In other words we need to examine the non-random nature of the "assignment" of subjects to various types of experimental input. The second group of factors concerns selectivity of this particular sample from the universe of potential subjects (Stinchcombe, 1968). Let us begin with the latter.

Problems Relating to Selectivity and Mortality

In Chapter II we pointed out the atypical nature of the two communities in which the study took place. Both are relatively wealthy and are known for the excellence of their educational institutions. Experts on both communities have commented that even the poor are relatively better off in these localities than they are in other parts of the country. In terms of the effectiveness of preschool programs, these factors might lead us to suspect that our results may have a conservative bias for the following reason.

The Westinghouse Report (Cicarelli, 1969) clearly demonstrated that Head Start programs were relatively most effective among the most deprived sectors of the population, i.e. in the South, in predominantly Black areas, and in core sections of our cities. In other areas of the country, the differences in school achievement between those who had attended year round Head Start programs and those who had not rarely approached statistical significance. Such evidence would lead us to believe that preschool education is relatively most effective where the need is greatest. This conclusion is also consistent with our propositions concerning differences between low socioeconomic status and high socioeconomic status children in relation to need for preschool programs (see propositions 8-10 and 11-13). The fact that our study generally found little difference in school achievement of low socioeconomic status children who had attended year-round Head Start and low socioeconomic status children who had attended no preschool program can probably be explained on the same grounds as the Westinghouse findings.

However, if preschool education is most effective among the most deprived sectors of the population, then we might also reason that more extensive preschool experiences, such as we suggest are offered in long day schools, might be even more relatively effective among the most deprived groups than in the rest of the population. Our data will show that on all indexes of scholastic achievement the low socioeconomic status children who attended long day schools did significantly better than low socioeconomic status children who attended short day schools. According to the line of reasoning followed above, it could be suggested that this difference would be magnified rather than diminished among other groups of children. Therefore, we would suggest that our results may be generalizable beyond the specific population studied.

Concerning the problem of selectivity of subjects within the sample, we must raise the question of the comparability of subjects involved in the different experimental groups. This type of question can never be resolved in a totally satisfactory fashion when self selection of subjects is permitted (Campbell, 1963). However, we can address ourselves to the problem by discussing the strategies that were used to cope with this specific design limitation. In order to do this, we will first concern ourselves with differences in recruitment practices between low socioeconomic status long and short day schools. The next step will be to discuss the use of antecedent variables and their bearing on the problem. The discussion will focus on the two main groups, those that had attended subsidized day care centers and those that had attended compensatory education programs, because it was in these groups that significant differences in school achievement were hypothesized to occur.

Comparison of Recruitment Process of Cell I and Cell II Institutions

At first glance, important types of differences appear, which could affect the comparability of the client populations. First, Head Start programs had a lower income ceiling than subsidized day care centers. Second, Head Start programs are free to the client whereas subsidized day care centers have a sliding scale of fees. Third, subsidized day care centers require that the mother work whereas no such requirement exists for Head Start programs. Fourth, Head Start personnel engage in more active recruitment.

Discussions with administrators of the programs indicated that the differences are far less clear cut than the above listing would suggest. It is true that Head Start stipulates a lower ceiling on family income. However, the programs have always knowingly accepted at least 10% to 15% of their clientele from families with incomes above the maximum allowed. Second, Head Start has never attempted more than acursory inquiry into family income whereas subsidized day care centers conduct a rigorous financial examination. Head Start personnel doubted that their income information was very reliable. They stressed that poverty needs to be defined in terms of the prevailing cost of living and that persons considerably above the federally defined poverty level were still poor by this community's standards. They also thought it unlikely that families with even one fully employed member would technically qualify for the program unless the family was unusually large. Therefore, the fact that 34% of the year round Head Start children had two employed parents would imply that income requirements were flexibly administered. Furthermore, subsidized day care centers give priority to children in lowest income families. Therefore, even though these centers are permitted to accept children from families with higher incomes, their clientele tends to come from the lower brackets of their income range, which is not very different from the Head Start maximum.

With respect to the problem of fees, it is important to realize that fees for full day care at the subsidized day care centers can be as low as $2.50 per week. It is true that Head Start is free but a working mother would presumably have to pay for baby sitting services to care for her children before and/or after Head Start. Such costs could easily exceed the subsidized day care center fees.

Concerning the subsidized day care center requirement that mothers of children admitted be employed full time, two points need to be made. First, subsidized day care centers also accept children if mothers are ill or out of the home or if full day care seems warranted for other reasons. In the present study only 81% of the mothers of children who had attended subsidized day care centers were employed. Furthermore, 50% of the mothers of children in year-round Head Start programs were also employed. Thus again, the differences are not as striking as we might have expected them to be.

In their methods of recruitment, Head Start was more aggressive than subsidized day care centers. However, even here the differences were not as great as appeared at first. Both types of programs relied heavily on advertising in laundromats, grocery stores and other places which poor people are thought to frequent. In addition, Head Start unquestionably engaged in a certain amount of door-to-door recruiting that the subsidized day care centers did not do. However, personnel from both types of programs observed independently that the families that they attracted were quite similar. Also, there is some movement back and forth between the two types of programs. To summarize, there are, undoubtedly, some differences in admission policy and procedures which would limit comparability of the two groups. These differences are not as great as a cursory appraisal would indicate. Their influence on school achievement cannot be estimated.

Study of Antecedent Variables

A second strategy to deal with the problem of selectivity within the sample was to collect demographic data to ascertain in what ways the groups were or were not comparable. The variables used were sex, race, family structure, number of siblings, and occupation of the father and mother. Originally, data on the birthplace of the child was also included. However, it was found that the population was overwhelmingly local in origin. Therefore, this factor was eliminated from further analysis. It is a pity that data on birthplace of parents and education of parents was not available since these might well be important factors.

The next chapter will give the results of this part of the investigation. Suffice it to say at this time that the target groups were found to be roughly comparable on most demographic factors. On those variables where significant differences were found to exist, a statistical test was run to determine whether a significant relationship existed between this background factor and the main criterion variable. These relationships invariably were found to be non-significant.

Of course, this analysis does not deal with possible differences in attitudinal variables except insofar as they can be inferred from demographic characteristics. Even though the groups were similar in demographic factors, we cannot rule out the possibility that families of low socioeconomic status children who attended long day schools (cell I) were already "more middle class" than families of children who attended cell II schools. If this were so, then differences in school achievement could be attributed to such attritudinal differences rather than to the experimental variable.

A study by Wolff and Stein (1965) on Factors Influencing Recruitment of Children into Head Start Programs may be somewhat pertinent on this point. The authors interviewed the families of two groups of children, matched by school, teacher, sex, age, ethnicity, approximate number of siblings, and primary language. The differentiating factor between the two groups was in attendance or non-attendance at Head Start programs. The results of this study showed that the two groups were extremely similar not only in social and economic factors but also in attitudinal factors such as educational aspirations for their children. The main difference between the two groups was that one group had heard of the Head Start program whereas the other had not. Although one cannot extrapolate very easily from the Wolff and Stein study to the present one, it may be possible to suggest on the basis of their findings that there is no clear evidence that important attitudinal differences exist between families of low socioeconomic status children who attend and who do not attend short day preschool programs, and therefore, perhaps also between children who attend long rather than short day programs.

Mortality

The other major source of invalidity in a post hoc design such as this is the mortality of the sample population. It is important to ask what kinds of biases are introduced as a result of the inevitable process of attrition. Later in this chapter we will discuss the representativeness of this sample for all the children who attended the low socioeconomic status preschool programs and are still in the school system. Our analysis will show that the "response rate" in this regard is quite high. However, a number of children who attended the preschool programs have left the school district. The effect of this type of mortality must also be estimated. Discussion with intake personnel at cell I and cell II programs revealed that the main losses occurred among children of university graduate students, who leave the community after their parents complete their studies. This group was mentioned by personnel from both types of programs. If this is indeed the main category of losses, then the results of this study ought to be more generalizable than if all the original attenders had been included. Children of graduate students who attend subsidized programs are one of the major exceptions, noted in Chapter III to the homogenious low socioeconomic status character of the client groups. In other words, in this particular case, mortality may have contributed to the validity rather than to invalidity of this study. However, the children of graduate students doubtless do not account for the total mortality in the sample population. It is difficult to estimate the effects of other losses on the results of the study.

In summary, a post hoc research design such as the one employed here, is subject to two major sources of invalidity, selectivity and mortality. This discussion has attempted to assess the importance of selectivity first by examining the special characteristics of the sample population relative to the universe from which the sample could have been drawn. We concluded that the high socioeconomic level of the communities in which the study was carried out probably introduced a conservative bias into the results. Our subsequent analysis of selectivity within the sample shows that the population in cell I and cell II may have lacked comparability as a result of differences in the recruitment processes of the two types of institutions. However, these differences are probably not as great as might have been anticipated by a superficial reading of the recruitment policies.

Furthermore, the study included information on demographic characteristics of the two populations to provide some estimate of differences in antecedent variables. The results show that the groups were roughly comparable on most demographic variables and that variables on which they differed significantly were not significantly related to the main dependent variable. There is no evidence in this study on which to estimate differences in attitudinal variables which might have contributed to invalidity of the results. Our brief discussion of mortality showed that a large fraction of the "losses" were probably children of graduate students who might have had to be dropped from the study if they had appeared in the sample. The reason is that such children come from families that are clearly middle class in their life styles even though the children may be eligible for subsidized programs because of the temporarily low economic status of their parents.

The following section will deal further with strategies that were used to cope with design limitations. They include the use of gross distinctions and multiple criterion variables. The reasoning behind use of these methods was the following: Since biases introduced by selectivity and mortality could not be completely eliminated, it would be preferable to use conservative methodology whenever alternatives presented themselves.

Use of Gross Distinctions

The reason for using gross rather than fine distinctions was to increase the reliability of the findings. For instance, the study employed occupational data as an indicator of life style. The correspondence between the concept and the indicator seemed to become clearer when collapsed categories were used. For example, in many cases it was difficult to distinguish a laborer from an operative but the methodology of this study placed them in the same category. Accordingly, the nine category census classification was collapsed to three. Professional, technical, and managerial occupations were considered "high," i.e. collapsing classifications 0-2. Clerical, sales, and skilled workers were considered "medium," i.e. collapsing classifications 3-5, and semi-skilled, unskilled, and service workers were classified as "low," i.e. collapsing classifications 6-9. The classification is difficult to employ mainly in the case of the self employed, who might fit anywhere along the scale. They were given a "high" classification unless there was clear evidence to the contrary. Also, there was some doubt whether laboratory technicians belong in the top category. Otherwise, this simple hierarchy probably reflects some important differences in life style, which could be presumed to affect school achievement. The same technique was used in regard to measures of school achievement, as will be shown below. The aim in all these instances was to emphasize major differences.

Use of Multiple Criterion Variables

In addition to using gross distinctions it was also considered advisable to use multiple criteria. This can be seen in the list of demographic variables which were used as an overall indicator of the comparability of the groups within the major socioeconomic status division. The same technique was applied to the dependent variables. Each single measure of school achievement was subject to limitations of reliability and validity. The use of a variety of independently derived measures permitted an estimate of internal consistency as a measure of validity. Furthermore, the use of multiple measures permits a more conservative interpretation of the overall results provided that the several measures point to the same conclusion. This is in line with the argument made by Stinchcombe (1968) regarding ways of enhancing the credibility of the desired result.

Another advantage of using multiple criterion variables is the probability that sources of bias will differ with independently derived measures. This appears to have been true in the present study. Each criterion measure had unique sources of bias, which will be discussed along with the findings in the next chapter. However, the types of bias did not overlap, which increases our confidence in the overall results of the study.

In summary, the first major section of this chapter has been devoted to a discussion of the problems of selectivity and mortality. The section concluded with a statement of some of the strategies that were used to produce a conservative bias in the results as a response to the particular problems that are inherent in a post hoc research design.

The Sample

The overall sample should probably be described as a truncated cohort. The original plan had called for analysis of the entire cohort of children who had started kindergarten in the Fall of 1967 and who would presumably have arrived in the second grade in the Fall of 1969. This plan proved unworkable for two reasons. First, for reasons external to the study only 10 of the 16 possible schools in the system could participate by submitting school records of their second graders for examination. Second, it proved impracticable to make recalls in order to obtain all the records of the second graders in even the cooperating schools. The reasons for these limitations cannot be discussed further in order to maintain confidentiality. However, the sample limitations probably did not greatly distort the results for two reasons. First, the cooperation of the individual schools did not depend on the nature of the study or on other factors that might be related to school achievement of various groups of children. Second, even the non-cooperating schools participated in the second stage of data collection (to be discussed below) where minimal information was obtained on the most important groups of children. Thus, on the whole, the study includes the most crucial information on the most important groups of children.

One of the chief disadvantages of this unusual sample is that tests of significance have only limited applicability in this situation. When they are given along with the results they should be interpreted as a

than as a measure of the probability of the occurrence of a given event.

In order to give a crude indication of the representativeness of the sample for the total population of children in the school system who belonged to the cohort, we estimated a "response rate" by calculating the percentage of cases made available at this stage of the study against the total number of second grade students listed for that school. The listing was derived from the superintendent's office print-out of all students registered at the time of the study.

The Overall Response Rate

The response rate was calculated from the data given in Table 3. The double line separates the data on schools that took part in this

TABLE 3

SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVENESS

Schools Included in First Stage Data Collection								Schools Included in Second Stage Only				
(1) School	(2) Number of Second Graders Listed	(3) Blacks Listed	(4) Percent Blacks (3) ÷ (2)	(5) Number of Listed Pupils Included in Sample	(6) Percent of Listed Pupils Included in Sample (5) ÷ (2)	(7)[b] Pupils Eliminated	(8)[c] Total Number of Pupils Included in Sample	(1) School	(2) Number of Second Graders Listed	(3) Blacks Listed	(4) Percent Blacks	(8) Total Number of Pupils Included in Sample
E[a]	49	18	37%	44	90%	17	30	F	56	16	29%	8
G	83	29	35%	72	87%	25	55	J	103	16	16%	9
H	75	22	29%	64	85%	34	39	L	77	22	31%	20
J[a]	100	28	28%	89	89%	12	80	N	42	8	19%	11
K	96	9	9%	82	86%	23	61	Q	48	8	17%	7
M	62	13	21%	50	81%	17	42	V	82	10	12%	8
P	107	18	17%	90	84%	36	65					
S	80	22	28%	69	86%	12	58					
T[a]	34	13	38%	23	68%	6	44					
U	70	18	26%	61	87%	24	47					

[a] Ungraded Schools. In these schools grade lists are less accurate.

[b] These children were eliminated from those available, column 5, because they do not belong in cohort, i.e. transfers, early entrants, third grade retainees.

[c] This includes second graders from school lists, column 5 minus column 7, plus bonafide second graders who had not been listed plus children who belonged to the cohort but were not at grade level, i.e. double promotions and retainees.

stage of data collection from those that did not. The right hand side includes the limited data available on schools that only took part in the second stage of data collection, which will be described below. Column 2 of the table shows the number of second graders listed for that school on the central office print-out. Column 5 shows the number of pupils from that list who were included in the sample. Column 6 gives the percentage of children who were included in the print-out who were also included in the sample. For all except one school over 80% of the children on the print-out were included. The one exception (school T), which had a "response rate" of only 68% is an ungraded school with admittedly less accurate grade listings. It should be noted that in this school the number of pupils in the sample considerably exceeded the number of pupils listed (column 8 versus column 2).

For each school, column 8 shows the total number of children in the sample. This total was calculated after certain children were eliminated because they did not belong in the cohort. Column 7 shows the number eliminated from each school. This group includes mainly third grade retainees and students who had transferred in after the beginning of kindergarten. This group did not take the same objective tests as the other children and was therefore excluded. By comparing column 8 with column 2 and column 7, it can be seen that in most schools some children were included in the sample who were not on the print-out. This applies in both graded and ungraded schools. Therefore, the calculated response rate (column 6) should be interpreted as only a rough estimate. A study of column 6 shows that among 10 schools included in the first stage of data collection, the response rate in all schools except the case mentioned above (school T) can be estimated at over 80%.

Representativeness of the Cooperating Schools

The next step is to determine the representativeness of the schools included by comparing the left and right hand sides of table 3. According to school administrators, the schools within the system are highly homogenious. Teacher-student ratios are similar as well as class size and availability of special services. Moreover, the district is integrated racially, both at the school and at the classroom level. Information on the children's race was given on the central office print-out. Therefore we can give a rough estimate of the representativeness of the sample by comparing the percentage of Black children in all schools, columns 4 in table 3 (on both sides). It will be noted that no school had less than 9% and none had more than 38% Black students. The mean percentage of Black children in the sample schools was 26.8%, which is quite close to the mean of Black students in the non-sample schools, which was 20.3%. Therefore by the only objective criterion available the sample seemed relatively representative.

Second Stage Data Collection

The foregoing procedure of data collection did not produce an adequate number of children from the target groups. Separate listings of children who had attended subsidized day care centers and year round Head Start showed that a large proportion of these children were in the school system but not at grade level. Accordingly, a second stage of data collection was designed to yield more limited data on children who belonged to the cohort but who had not yet been included in the sample. A simple, short questionnaire, a copy of which is included in the appendix, was sent to the schools for each child in the target groups. The necessary data could be taken directly off the record by the teacher or a member of the clerical staff. This information was collected for children who had attended a subsidized day care center and had not been previously included in the sample and children who had attended year round Head Start and had not been previously included in the sample.

Such information was also sought for other children who belonged to the same cohort but who were not at grade level. It was fortunate that such information could be obtained from the entire school system (N = 16 schools). For cell I and cell II children it was particularly important to obtain at least a limited amount of information because they were the main focus of this analysis. For the children who were not at grade level such information was desirable because it was not known whether schools had uniform promotion policies. This was particularly important because the children's promotion became the main criterion of school achievement. The final count showed that all except three year round Head Start children who were still in the school system were included in the final sample. All except four of the subsidized day care center children still in the school system were included and all children not at grade level were included in the study.

In summary, the second stage of data collection was designed to obtain at least minimal information on the most important groups of children. The results of this effort show that almost all of these children were included in the final sample.

Classification of Children by Preschool Attendance

On the basis of information from the records the children were placed into one of the six groups shown in figure 3 below. In the few cases where a child had attended both long and short day institutions he was put into the appropriate long day category. It will be noted that this is a simple extension of the typology presented in figure 1. The two added groups serve as controls. Because of the small sample of children who had attended a subsidized day care center (cell I) all were included regardless of the length of time they had attended.

Figure 3. The Comparison Groups

	Low Socioeconomic Status	High Socioeconomic Status
Long School Day	I. Attended Subsidized Day Care Center (N = 21)	III. Attended Private Day Care Center (N = 46)
Short School Day	II. Attended Year-Round Head Start Program (N = 98)	IV. Attended Private Nursery School (N = 231)
None (Controls)	V. Eligible But Did Not Attend (N = 40)	VI. Not Eligible and Did Not Attend (N = 148)

Among those who had enrolled in Head Start programs, only those were included who had attended at least six months. There were two reasons for this. First, year-round Head Start attenders would be more comparable to children attending subsidized day care centers in terms of the length of time they spent in the program. Second, year-round Head Start children were more similar in crucial demographic variables to the cell II children than children who had attended only during the summer. As table 4 shows, all children who only attended the summer Head Start sessions came from intact families whereas a considerable fraction of children in year-round Head Start came from one-parent or broken homes. Also, children who attended only briefly had fewer siblings than long term attenders.

Two groups of children were eliminated from further analysis. One group consisted of cases where it was not clear whether in fact the child had attended a preschool program or not. The other group consisted of children who had attended but information was insufficient to permit placement into groups I through IV.

If a child had clearly not attended any kind of preschool, then the question was raised whether he would have been eligible to attend a subsidized program. This determination was made on the basis of his address. In order to allocate Title I. educational funds to disadvantaged children, the school system had developed a geographical code whereby they could predict reasonably accurately whether a child qualified as disadvantaged. This method turned out to be a conservative predictor. The total sample of children was classified as eligible or not on the basis of address. It was apparent that a considerable group of children who attended subsidized programs were not eligible by this criterion. This is in line with the Head Start recruitment policy noted previously whereby at least 10% to 15% of the children accepted do not meet the poverty criterion. On the other hand, very few children deemed eligible had attended private preschools. Accordingly, a child who was eligible and had not attended a preschool was placed in group V, which served as a control for groups I and II. If he had not attended and

TABLE 4

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF HEAD START CHILDREN BY LENGTH OF TIME ATTENDED

Demographic Characteristics	Length of Time Attended												
	Less than 3 mo.		3-6 mo.		7-9 mo.		10-12 mo.		More than 1 yr.		Don't Know		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Family Structure													
Both Parents	15	100	8	89	46	61	7	87	9	60	14	78	99
Mother Only	0	0	1	11	23	31	1	12	4	27	4	22	33
Remainder	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	0	2	13	0	0	8
Total	15	100	9	100	54	100	8	100	15	100	18	100	140
Number of Sibs													
0-2	9	60	5	56	22	29	3	37	5	33	10	55	54
3 or More	5	33	3	33	53	71	5	63	9	60	8	45	83
Don't Know	1	7	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	3
Total	15	100	9	100	54	100	8	100	15	100	18	100	140

was not eligible by this standard, he was placed in group VI, which served as a control for groups III and IV. Thus, all the children on whom information on preschool attendance was available were classified according to the typology of preschools discussed previously. Non-attenders were classified as eligible or ineligible for subsidized programs by means of a geographical code. The eligible non-attenders became a control group for the low socioeconomic status children and the ineligible non-attenders served as a control group for the high socioeconomic status children.

Distribution of Sample Children Within the School System

The six groups of children were quite evenly distributed throughout the school system, as can be seen in table 5. The schools above the heavy line are those that participated in the first stage of data collection. Of these, only a single school yielded no cases in a single cell. This was the subsidized day care center group, which were the rarest element in the population. The null categories below the heavy line indicate, as expected, that almost no high socioeconomic status children were among the special categories sought in the second stage of data collection.

This discussion of the sample showed that data for this study was collected in two stages. In the first stage, relatively complete information was obtained on second graders in 10 of the 16 schools in the school system. Analysis of the sample showed that the response rate for the schools that took part was almost uniformly above 80%. The schools included in the first stage of data collection were relatively representative of the total school system. According to the only

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESCHOOL GROUPS BY SCHOOLS

Schools	Preschool Groups						
	I SDCC	II H-S	V Control	III PDCC	IV PNS	VI Control	Total
E	2	10	3	1	7	7	30
G	2	5	5	6	18	19	55
H	1	6	4	4	13	11	39
I	2	7	6	8	49	8	80
K	2	5	2	2	37	13	61
M	1	9	2	2	17	11	42
P	3	8	2	7	18	26	64
S	2	3	3	7	31	12	58
T	1	4	3	5	13	19	45
U	0	4	2	2	21	18	47
F	0	6	2	0	0	0	8
J	2	3	1	1	1	1	9
L	1	13	1	0	3	2	20
N	1	6	1	1	2	0	11
Q	0	5	1	0	1	0	7
V	1	4	2	0	0	1	8
Totals	21	98	40	46	231	148	584

objective criterion available, the mean percentage of Black children in schools included in the first stage of data collection was close to the mean percentage of Black children in schools not included.

Because this method of data collection did not provide sufficient data on several crucial groups of children, a second stage of data collection was initiated. This was designed to yield at least some information on cell I and cell II children who were missing from the sample at this time. Also, this stage was needed to provide information on members of the cohort who were not at grade level and had therefore not been included in the sample. The total sample of children were widely distributed throughout the school system.

Measures of School Achievement

The achievement measures were selected to provide an indication of the children's ability to conform with normative expectations in their role as students. The most obvious criterion of this standard is the child's ability to pass normally from one grade to the next. If a child is not passed normally, this provides a clear indication that his performance as a student is out of line with normative expectations. Because this measure most clearly met the required theoretical specifications, it was chosen as the main criterion variable in the analysis.

Three other criteria were used in the selection process. The information needed to be available in existing records. The measures needed to be derived independently of each other. They were expected to tap non-academic as well as standard academic skills. Besides the child's promotion pattern, two other measures were selected. They were his scores on two objective achievement tests and his teacher's comments concerning behavior problems in the classroom.

Promotion Pattern of the Child

This measure was derived from the child's school record in the following manner. At the end of each school year, the teacher notes on the child's record his class assignment for the following year. In most cases, this involves a simple notation indicating that the child will be promoted into the following grade. In a few cases, children were even double promoted but this was very rare. In some cases, however, the teacher noted that the child was being promoted with serious reservations or promoted only because his parents objected strenuously to his retention. In other cases, the teacher noted that the child would be retained. Thus for each year that a child attended school, he could be described as having achieved a "clear pass" (normal promotion or double promotion) or as "not" having achieved a clear pass (promoted with reservations, promoted because of parental pressure, retained, or placed into an educably mentally handicapped class). These measures were then combined for the two years that the child had attended school. Thus, in order to be classified as a "clear pass" the child had to have been normally promoted (or better) at the end of both kindergarten and first grade. If he had "not" been clearly passed at either the end of kindergarten or at the end of first grade (or both), he was classified as "not" clearly passed.

The reason that the promotion data had to be combined for the two years was that sometimes it was difficult to tell exactly when in his school career a child had run into promotion difficulties. Therefore, this measure indicates the child's total promotion pattern rather than his promotion at the end of kindergarten and at the end of first grade. If a child is classified as "not," this means that he had difficulties at some point in his school career.

This measure could not be applied to children who had spent their most recent school year in an ungraded school, he was classified as "ungraded."

This measure is particularly meaningful because of its reliability. A decision not to promote a child normally is not lightly arrived at. It is a group decision that involves the collective judgment of several staff members. This decision has significance for the school bureaucracy and for the child's permanent record. Accordingly, it probably has greater stability than either of the other two measures of school achievement.

Objective Achievement Tests

The second measure of school achievement consists of two objective, standardized tests, that were administered by the teachers but scored by the Educational Testing Service. In the Fall of the kindergarten year, all children were given the Caldwell Preschool Inventory. This test was developed specifically for use with disadvantaged children. As the author says, the instrument was designed to provide "an indication of how much a disadvantaged child . . . had achieved in areas regarded as necessary foundations for subsequent success in school" (Caldwell, 1967, p. 1). A factor analysis of the test items showed that it tapped three main areas of achievement:

(1) concept activation concerning ordinal and numerical relations and sensory attributes, e.g. color, size, shape, motion, (2) personal-social responsiveness, i.e. knowledge of the child's personal world, his name, parts of his body, and his ability to carry out simple instructions, and (3) associative vocabulary, i.e. the ability to understand the meaning of words by labeling geometric figures, and so forth. This is an individual test that is enjoyable for the child and takes only about 15 minutes to administer. The split-half reliability is .95.

In the Fall of first grade, all children were given the *Cooperative Primary Listening Test*, Form 12A. Like the *Preschool Inventory*, this is a test of achievement rather than of potential. Also, the test focuses on improvable skills and it eliminates reading as a barrier to demonstrating other abilities. The *Listening Test* requires not just receiving the spoken word but also comprehension, recall, and interpretation. It also depends on the child's ability to perform school related social skills because it tests the child's capacity to pay attention to auditory stimuli over time and to concentrate on what the teacher is saying. This is a group test with an internal consistency coefficient of about .81.

These test scores were not universally available. Children who had run into difficulties with promotion were less likely to have taken the tests or to have the results recorded. There may be many reasons for this, not the least of which is that these children were probably less readily available for testing. They were more likely to be absent from the classroom either because they were receiving special instruction elsewhere or because they had poor attendance records. The problems associated with obtaining test results on low socioeconomic status children have been noted by other investigators (Deutsch, 1960). Accordingly, the results from these tests must be interpreted with considerable caution, considering the likelihood of bias in the availability of test scores.

Teachers' Comments

The final measure used is the absence of teachers' comments regarding unacceptable classroom behavior. Every yearly report on a child reserves space for teacher's comments. Also the short form developed for this study asked the teacher to comment on any problems that interfere with a child's learning. Teachers were free to ignore this option or to comment on any aspect of a child's performance they chose. If the teacher used this opportunity to mention that the child showed behavior problems, this was accepted as an indicator of inability to perform social or interactional skills. This indicator may suffer from bias related to a teacher's tolerance for deviance and willingness to do paperwork beyond the minimum required. Also, because it depends on such variables as the teacher's personality and mood and because it is not considered as importantly the school as the child's promotion, this measure is probably the least reliable of the three indicators of school achievement used in this study. Nevertheless, it probably reflects the most serious manifestations of children's classroom problems and has meaning in this limited sense. It differs from the child's promotion pattern because it involves an independent judgment by the teacher, not a formal decision arrived at by several concerned persons. Also, a child's promotion probably depends more on cognitive skills, whereas the teacher's comments were included for analysis only when they referred specifically to non-academic aspects of the student role. Therefore, this measure probably provides the best indication of a child's ability to meet normative expectations in non-cognitive areas of school performance.

It would have been useful to use grades as an indicator of achievement if they had been uniformly available. However, such information was restricted to children whose records were obtained in the first stage of data collection. Thus, there is virtually no information on grades of children who did poorly in school. Since the information on grades was available only for kindergarten and first grade and only for students who had done reasonably well, there was practically no differentiation in grades. Therefore, they were not used as a measure of achievement.

In summary, three measures of school achievement were used. The first and main criterion variable was the child's promotion pattern. It was chosen to serve as a general measure of the child's ability to meet the normative expectations associated with the role of student. It is known for every child who attended a grade class during first grade. The second measure was a set of two objective tests that are routinely administered to all children in this particular school system. The *Caldwell Preschool Inventory* is given to kindergarten children to measure their general readiness for school work. The *Cooperative Primary Listening Test* is given to all first grade students as a measure of school achievement. Both tests were designed with disadvantaged children in mind. Both tests were scored by an agency that is independent of the school.

The final measure of school achievement was the absence of teachers' comments concerning unacceptable school behavior. This measure is similar to the first in that it reflects the teachers' subjective judgment concerning the child. It is different because her comments on the child's behavior reflect her individual judgment whereas a decision regarding a child's promotion is probably a pooled judgment of various staff members.

The use of these three measures was especially useful in this situation because they reflect different kinds of skills. The objective tests are most clearly related to cognitive skills whereas teachers' comments were only coded when they referred to social, motivational or interactional skills. Together, the results should give an indication of a child's ability to meet acceptable standards of school performance.

CHAPTER VII

RESULTS

This chapter will present the findings on the relationship between the length of the preschool day, socioeconomic status of the client group and school achievement. The basic hypothesis of the study anticipated that low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day preschools would do better in elementary school than those who had attended short day preschools (or none at all). For children of high socioeconomic status it was anticipated that preschool attendance would make little difference in school achievement. In terms of the six groups, this meant that:

1. Cell I children would do better than those in cell II.
2. Cell III, cell IV, and cell VI children would do about equally well in school achievement.
3. It was also anticipated that cell I children would do better than those in cell V but this was incidental to the primary focus of the analysis.

This hypothesis will be tested in terms of the three criteria of school achievement discussed in the last chapter.

Promotion Pattern

In the previous chapter we noted that promotion pattern would be used as the chief criterion variable. All children who had not attended ungraded schools in the most recent year were classified as "clearly passed" or "not" clearly passed. They were defined as "clearly passed" if they had been normally promoted (or double promoted) after *both* kindergarten and first grade. All other cases, except children in "ungraded" schools, were classified as "not" clearly passed. This label covered children who had been promoted with reservations, promoted in response to parental pressure, retained, or placed into educably mentally handicapped classes *either* at the end of kindergarten *or* at the end of first grade (or both).

The promotion results are shown in table 6. Among low socioeconomic status children, on the left hand side of the table, 75% of those who had attended long day preschools had "clearly passed," whereas less than half of those who had attended short day preschools had done as well. The differences between cell I and II and between cell I and V are significant by the X^2 test at the p .05 level.

Among the high socioeconomic status groups (right hand side of the table), differences are very minor. The overwhelming majority of these children "clearly passed." It should be noted that even the most successful low socioeconomic group was not as successful as the least successful high socioeconomic status group. Nevertheless, those who had attended subsidized day care centers were more nearly able to compete with their more advantaged peers than other low socioeconomic status children.

It is also instructive to look more closely at the children in cell I who did "not" clearly pass. Two of the four were promoted but with reservations. The other two were retained but neither one before

TABLE 6

PROMOTION PATTERN BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Promotion Pattern	Preschool Group													
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clear Pass	12	67	37	46[a]	13	46[b]	28	88	153	92	108	92	352	80
Not	4	33	44	54	15	54	4	12	14	8	10	8	90	20
Total	16	100	81	100	28	100	32	100	167	100	118	100	442	100
(Ungraded)	(5)		(17)		(12)		(14)		(64)		(30)		(142)	

[a] After eliminating "Ungraded" X^2 on groups I, II = 4.8 $p < .05$.

[b] After eliminating "Ungraded" X^2 on groups I, III = 3.3 $p < .05$.

the end of first grade. One of the two retainees had attended a day care center for only a very short time, certainly less than four months. The other was one of only two children in the entire sample who lives alone with his father.

In summary, low socioeconomic status children who attended long day preschool programs clearly were superior to low socioeconomic status children who attended short day preschools in their promotion patterns. Low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day programs also did better than the control groups of children who were eligible but had attended no preschool program. Both findings are statistically significant but it must be remembered that tests of significance have limited applicability on all these measures because of the nature of the sample.

Among high socioeconomic status children, cells III, IV, and VI, no significant differences were found on this measure. These results are especially important because, as we noted in the last chapter, a child's promotion pattern is probably the best single overall measure of his ability to meet normative expectations of the three that will be used in this study.

Although we can be confident that cell I children exceeded cell II children on this criterion, it is difficult to interpret this finding in terms of the four kinds of skills discussed in chapter V. It is quite possible that this measure is not solely related to the child's cognitive skills as these are reflected in his academic performance. Cicourel and Kitsuse's study of The Educational Decision Makers (1963) showed that a number of factors outside of a child's academic performance entered into decisions regarding a child's placement within the social system of the school. However, the Cicourel study was carried out in a high school where college admission policies played a major role in shaping the decision making process. A decision to steer a child towards an ivy league or non ivy league college does not relate to the fundamental normative requirements associated with the student role as much as a decision not to promote a child normally from one grade to the next. It is hardly likely that a negative decision regarding promotion is made without strong academic justification. However, a low socioeconomic status child with academic difficulties is likely to suffer from deficiencies in social, interactional and motivational skills as well. Therefore, these non-cognitive skills probably enter into the final decision even when they are not the prime determinants of a decision regarding the child's promotion.

Relation of Promotion Pattern to Demographic Characteristics

Because of the significant differences in promotion patterns of cell I and cell II children, it is important to determine whether these findings can be attributed to differences in the demographic characteristics of the comparison groups. Therefore, we will need to assess the comparability of the three groups within the low socioeconomic status category. The major emphasis in this discussion will be on differences between children in cell I and cell II because they had attended preschools that differed with respect to length of day, which is the major theme in this investigation.

Information on relevant demographic characteristics is given in tables 7 through 9b. Table 7 shows that the low socioeconomic status groups did not differ significantly on race and sex. Table 8 shows that they were relatively similar in family structure, and table 9a shows their similarity in father's occupational status. On these three characteristics the three low socioeconomic status groups were roughly homogenious.

However, on number of siblings and occupational status of mother, cell I and cell II children were significantly different. Table 8 shows that among low socioeconomic status groups, Head Start children (cell II) were significantly more likely than subsidized day care center children (cell I) to have more than three siblings. Table 9b shows that mothers of Head Start children (cell II) were more likely to be at home whereas mothers of subsidized day care children (cell I) were more likely to be working.

TABLE 7

RACE AND SEX CHARACTERISTICS BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Race	Preschool Group													
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	5	24	15	15	9	23	35	76	226	98	136	92	426	72
Black	15	71	83	85	29	74	11	24	5	2	12	8	155	27
(Don't Know)	1	5	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100
Sex														
Males	9	43	50	51	24	62	24	52	124	54	79	53	310	53
Females	12	57	48	49	16	38	22	48	107	46	69	47	274	47
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100

TABLE 8

FAMILY STRUCTURE AND NUMBER OF SIBLINGS BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Family Structure	Preschool Group													
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Both Parents	15	71	62	63	27	67	38	83	222	96	136[c]	92	500	86
Mother Only[a]	5	24	28	29	10	26	8	17	8	3	12	8	71	12
Remainder[b]	1	5	8	8	3	7	0	0	1	.5	0	0	13	2
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100
Number of Siblings														
0-2	12	57	30[d]	31	18[e]	44	40	87	178	77	104	70	382	65
3 or more	6	29	67	68	20	51	6	13	53	23	40	27	192	33
(Don't Know)	3	14	1	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	2
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100

[a] Includes cases of mother with another man, e.g. stepfather, grandfather.

[b] Includes cases of father without mother or with another woman, e.g. stepmother, grandfather, as well as children living with guardians or other relatives only.

[c] After eliminating the "Remainders" X^2 on groups III, IV, VI = 13.8 $p < .01$.

[d] After eliminating the "Don't Knows" X^2 on groups I, II = 8.4 $p < .01$.

[e] After eliminating the "Don't Knows" X^2 on groups, I, II, V = 14.6 $p < .01$.

TABLE 9a

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF PARENTS BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Occupational Status of Father	Preschool Group													
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	1	5	10	10	2	3	25	54	182[e]	79	67[d]	45	287	49
Medium	4	19	16	16	8	20	8	18	33	14	43	29	112	19
Low	11	52	40	41	18	46	5	11	4	2	22	15	100	17
Out of Home	5	24	27	28	10	26	7	15	8	3	12	8	69	12
Remainder[a]	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	2	10	2
(Don't Know)	0	0	1	1	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	1
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100
Occupational Status of Mother[b]														
High	1	5	4	4	1	3	3	7	34	15	9	6	52	9
Medium	4	19	6	6	1	2	11	24	9	4	8	5	39	7
Low	11	52	38	39	21	54	1	2	4	2	7	5	82	14
Housewife or Unemployed	3	14	46	47	13	31	30	65	182	78	123	83	397	68
Remainder[c]	2	10	3	3	1	2	0	0	1	.5	0	0	7	1
(Don't Know)	0	0	1	1	3	8	1	2	1	.5	1	1	7	1
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100

[a] Includes those unemployed and those that cannot be classified.

[b] Tests of significance were performed only for collapsed categories, table 9a because of large number of small cells.

[c] Includes those out of home and those that cannot be classified.

[d] Eliminating Don't Knows and Remainders X^2 on groups III, IV, VI = 54.5 $p < .001$.

[e] Eliminating Don't Knows and Remainders X^2 on groups III, IV = 22.2 $p < .001$.

TABLE 9b

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MOTHER BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Occupational Status of Mother	Preschool Group													
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Working[a]	17	81	49[d]	50	23[c]	58	15	33	47	20	24	16	175	30
Not Working[b]	3	14	46	47	13	31	30	65	182	79	123	83	397	68
Not In Home	1	5	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	.5	0	0	5	1
(Don't Know)	0	0	1	1	3	8	1	2	1	.5	1	1	7	1
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100

[a] Includes categories High, Medium, Low and those working but cannot be classified.

[b] Includes all women at home, i.e. housewives and unemployed.

[c] Excluding those Not In Home and Don't Knows X^2 on groups I, II, V = 8.5 $p < .02$.

[d] Excluding those Not In Home and Don't Knows X^2 on groups I, II = 7.4 $p < .01$.

The first difference would lead us to predict that cell I children would do better than cell II children for the following reason. According to Lenrow (1968) low socioeconomic status children with a large number of siblings were less likely to show a high level of achievement than low socioeconomic status children with a small number of siblings. He attributed this finding to differences in the amount of interaction between mothers and children. In large low socioeconomic status families a mother has less time available for each child than in small low socioeconomic status families.

If we follow along this train of reasoning, we might suggest that maternal employment should also exert a negative influence on the child's school achievement because working mothers have less time to spend with their children than non-working mothers. Therefore, the larger percentage of employed mothers among cell I children would lead us to predict that this group would do less well than cell II children where a smaller percentage of mothers are employed. However, we have also argued previously (proposition 4) that employed mothers exert less counterpressure to the socialization process of preschools which permits more adequate socialization to occur. If this is true, then maternal employment may be a positive influence on a child's school achievement. However, this effect may be limited to the situation where the child is attending a long day preschool. Otherwise, it makes little sense to speak of counterpressures to an ongoing socialization process.

Actually, the whole question of the effect of maternal employment on children's school achievement is rather unclear. Prodipto in his study of "Maternal Employment and Adolescent Roles" (1961) found a negative relationship between maternal employment and school performance among rural but not among urban children. In sum, it may be wisest to make no theoretical predictions regarding the effects of maternal employment on school achievement.

At any rate, the next step in the analysis is to examine the relationship between these two demographic variables and school achievement within cell I and cell II. Table 10 shows that there was no significant relationship between occupational status of mother and promotion pattern within the Head Start group (cell II). Table 11 shows that the same can be said of the relationship between number of siblings and promotion pattern. The tables also show the relationship for group I but because of small sample size, tests of significance were restricted to group II. For further information, tables 14, 15 and 16, in the appendix, show the relationship between other demographic variables and the promotion pattern within groups I and II.

Of course it would have been desirable to examine the influence of these demographic characteristics in greater detail by looking at interactions among these factors. For instance, it might be expected that low socioeconomic status mothers with large families would tend to stay at home because the cost of child care would consume a large fraction of their potential earnings. Such children would be eligible only for Head Start. Mothers with small families might be more likely to apply for subsidized day care center services to enable them to work. They might even find it financially worth while to purchase child care by sending a child or two over to a neighbor before and/or after Head Start, because this would be far less expensive than to hire someone to come to the house to care for a large brood.

TABLE 10

WITHIN GROUPS I AND II OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF MOTHER BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)

Occupational Status of Mother	GROUP I						GROUP II					
	Clear Pass		Not		Total		Clear Pass		Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Working	10	77	3	23	13	100	17	41	24	59	41	100
Not Working	2	100	0	0	2	100	19	51	18	49	37	100
Not in Home	0	0	1	100	1	100	1	50	1	50	2	100
(Don't Know)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	1	100

TABLE 11

WITHIN GROUPS I AND II NUMBER OF SIBLINGS BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)

Number of Siblings	GROUP I						GROUP II					
	Clear Pass		Not		Total		Clear Pass		Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-2	8	80	2	20	10	100	8	40	12	60	20	100
3 or more	2	67	1	33	3	100	28	47	32	53	60	100
(Don't Know)	2	67	1	33	3	100	1	100	0	0	1	100

Therefore, it would have been interesting to compare the school achievement of cell II children from large families with working mothers with cell II children from small families with working mothers and so forth. Unfortunately, such further analysis was precluded by the relatively small size of the samples within each cell.

Thus, although cell I and cell II children were found to be significantly different in size of family and in mother's employment, we found that these demographic characteristics were not significantly related to promotion patterns within the two cells.

Among high socioeconomic status children differences in promotion pattern were so minor that it may not be necessary to examine the relationship between demographic characteristics and promotion patterns. Nevertheless, it may be instructive to look at the achievement of the few Black children in high socioeconomic status preschool groups. Among the children in graded glasses, there were six Black children in private day care centers (group III) and two Black children in private nursery schools (group IV). Of the six in group III, five "clearly passed." It is difficult to assess the socioeconomic status of these children. For the six children in group III it is difficult to determine whether or not they were "scholarship" children. The Black children in group IV are much more clearly from low socioeconomic status homes. The poor achievement of the two children in group IV is in line with the Karnes (1969) finding that when Head Start children were integrated into private nursery schools, they did not gain as much as when they were placed in programs that were designed specifically to meet their needs. The relatively good showing of Black children in group III offers additional support for the major findings of this study.

In summary, this discussion of the relationship between promotion pattern and demographic variables has focused primarily on low socioeconomic status children because it was among them that significant differences were established between school achievement on this criterion and type of preschool attended. The data show that cell I and cell II children did not differ significantly on race, sex, and occupational status of the father. They did differ significantly in the number of siblings and in employment of the mother. When we examined the relationship of these last two demographic variables and promotion patterns within cell I and cell II, no significant differences were found. Therefore, we might conclude that length of the preschool day was an important predictor of school achievement by this criterion. The relationship between demographic characteristics and school achievement for high socioeconomic status groups was not examined at this time because among the three comparison groups, no significant differences in promotion pattern were found.

Therefore, the findings relating to this first criterion of school achievement support the central hypothesis of the study. Among high socioeconomic status groups, preschool attendance did not greatly affect school achievement. Almost all high socioeconomic status children did well on this crude criterion regardless of whether they had attended long day preschools, short day preschools, or no preschools at all.

Objective Test Scores

As we mentioned in the last chapter, a second measure of school achievement was the children's performance on two objective tests.

This measure was chosen because it did not depend on the teacher's judgment, whereas the other two measures do. Also, this measure reflects much more minute differences in school achievement than the other two criteria. Table 12 shows the results of these two sets of test scores. The Preschool Inventory was given in kindergarten and the Cooperative Primary Listening Test was given when the children were in first grade. Among the three low socioeconomic status groups on the left side of the table, the results are consistent with the findings on the previous measure. On every set of scores cell I children did better than those in cell II. On both Subtests A and B and on total Inventory scores the results approached significance. In the other cases the results were in the same direction.

It seems clear that differences between cell I and cell II were greater on Subtests A and B than on Subtests C and D but it is difficult to interpret this finding. Subtest A includes a set of items relating to personal-social responsiveness, e.g. knowledge of the child's name, parts of his body, the ability to follow simple instructions. Subtest B is designed to test the child's associative vocabulary, e.g. the child is asked to show his awareness of the meaning of words, to label geometric figures like a circle, triangle, etc. Subtest C is concerned with concept activation in the areas of ordinal and numerical relations and Subtest D is concerned with concept activation in terms of sensory attributes, e.g. form, color, size, shape. Thus, all four subtests appear to be similar in their strong emphasis on cognitive skills as described in Chapter V. Without additional evidence, it is probably safest to restrict the interpretation of these findings to the consistent pattern of differences favoring cell I over cell II.

TABLE 12

OBJECTIVE TEST SCORES BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Objective Tests[g]	Preschool Group											
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI	
Preschool Inventory	N = 17		N = 81		N = 32		N = 39		N = 213		N = 124	
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Subtest A	20.9	2.8	18.8[a]	3.9	18.2[a]	3.6	21.5	3.5	22.3	2.8	21.2[a]	3.1
Subtest B	13.2	3.9	11.0[d]	4.8	11.8	5.6	17.0	5.0	18.2	4.2	16.0[d]	4.8
Subtest C	10.9	2.6	9.7	3.4	9.6	4.2	12.9	3.2	14.2[b]	2.8	12.5[b]	3.5
Subtest D	14.7	2.4	14.2	3.2	13.7	3.6	16.7	2.9	17.3[e]	1.8	16.4[e]	2.5
Total Score	59.6	8.8	52.3[c]	14.8	53.2	15.2	68.1	13.0	72.0[c]	9.9	66.1[c]	12.0
Cooperative Primary Listening	N = 19		N = 74		N = 31		N = 41		N = 209		N = 139	
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Form 12A	23.1	5.5	21.2	6.2	21.3	5.9	27.8	7.2	30.7[f]	7.5	28.3[f]	7.0

[a] Group I & II
Group I & V
Group IV & VI

[b] Group III & IV
Group IV & VI

[c] Group I & II
Group III & IV
Group IV & VI

[d] Group I & II
Group IV & VI

[e] Group III & IV
Group IV & VI

[f] Group III & IV
Group IV & VI

[g] Differences between all pairs of means were tested with a t-test. The results reported are those that reached significance at the $p < .05$ level or less.

Among the high socioeconomic status groups, on the right side of the table, we can see that all scores were relatively high. These children showed a higher overall level of achievement on these tests. However, within the high socioeconomic status category, significant differences are also apparent. Cell IV children, those who had attended short day schools, consistently did better than children who had attended long day schools (cell III) and those who had not attended any preschool (cell VI). In order to interpret this finding, let us examine the demographic characteristics of the high socioeconomic status groups, to assess the comparability of those who had attended long and short day preschool programs, and those who had failed to attend any preschools at all.

Demographic Characteristics of High Socioeconomic Status Groups

If we glance back at tables 7 through 9b, we will note that any significant differences in demographic characteristics consistently favored the children who had attended short day schools, cell IV. The groups differed significantly on family structure and on father's occupational status. Table 8 shows that private day care center children, cell III, were more likely to come from broken homes than those attending private short day schools, group IV. Also, table 9a shows that fathers of children in private short day schools had significantly higher occupational status than either of the other two groups of children. These findings might suggest that children in cell IV came from homes where they received a great deal of attention from adults and support for their school work. Staff of cell IV schools often called attention to the fact that the children tended to come disproportionately from families with a high level of sophistication. The teachers thought that the children profited a great deal from the intellectual atmosphere in their homes.

Also, we should note that these two demographic characteristics might be presumed to exert a cumulative effect, favoring cell IV children.

We can probably discount the possibility that attendance at short rather than long day schools was a major determinant of these children's superior achievement for two reasons. First, as we showed in our discussion of the typology in chapter V, short day high socioeconomic status schools produced a minimum of learning of school related skills. Second, many of the children in cell IV spent very little time at the preschools they attended. Several of the more popular schools in this category take children for only one or two half days a week. Such a limited preschool experience could hardly be expected to produce a large educational impact. Therefore, we can conclude this part of the analysis by suggesting that the superior achievement of cell IV children on objective tests was probably due more to their particularly "advantaged" status as reflected in their demographic characteristics than to any educational superiority of short day schools for high socioeconomic status children.

Before closing this section, we must call attention once more to the fact that not all children were tested (or had their scores recorded) even though these tests were, in theory, uniformly administered to all children at the appropriate grade levels. In general, a lower percentage of low socioeconomic status than of high socioeconomic status children were tested. Also, a lower percentage of children who were "not" clearly passed were tested than of children who were "clearly passed." This is an additional reason to interpret these findings with caution.

Furthermore, these findings cannot be interpreted as clearly with respect to normative expectations as those regarding promotion patterns. The published norms for both tests are not clearly applicable. For the Preschool Inventory separate norms are available for disadvantaged and middle class children (Caldwell, 1967). However, the norms are calculated according to the age of the child in months. It is difficult to tell exactly how old the children involved in this study were when they took the tests. Also, the samples of children on which the norms were based are so small that the reliability of the data may be questioned. Nevertheless, it may be interesting to note that the low socioeconomic status children in this study achieved higher percentile ranks (relative to their norms) than the high socioeconomic status children.

It is even more difficult to interpret the results from the Cooperative Primary Listening Test in terms of national norms. For these tests, only one rather than two sets of norms is given. These norms are based on test administration at the end of the first grade rather than at the beginning, which was when these tests were given to the children involved in this study. Accordingly, it is not surprising that these test results fall at the low end of the scale.

In summary, the data on objective achievement test scores offers support for the central hypothesis. Among low socioeconomic status groups cell I children consistently did better than those in cell II.

This result can be seen in all subtest scores as well as in total scores. Among high socioeconomic status children, all groups showed a high level of achievement. However, comparison of groups within the high socioeconomic status category showed that those who had attended short day preschools did better than those who had attended long day schools. This result was interpreted by analyzing the demographic characteristics of the high socioeconomic status comparison groups. The data showed that differences between the comparison groups consistently favored cell IV children. We also pointed out that many cell IV children attended preschools so little that the difference in scholastic achievement can hardly be attributed to any educational superiority of cell IV schools. Therefore, we suggest that the higher scores of cell IV children are probably related to their more "advantaged" backgrounds. Finally, we have indicated that scores on objective tests were not equally available for all groups of children. Children who had done poorly as measured by their promotion patterns were less likely to have been tested. The results on objective test scores must be interpreted cautiously in view of this important source of possible bias.

Teachers' Comments Concerning Classroom Problems

As we mentioned in the last chapter, our final measure of school achievement was the absence of teachers' comments concerning unacceptable classroom behavior. Such behaviors can roughly be classified into four major types: (1) acting out behaviors, e.g. temper tantrums, inability to sit still, etc., (2) requiring excessive supervision from the teacher, (3) inability to get along with peers, e.g. fighting, teasing, stealing, etc., and (4) general immaturity, e.g. unwillingness to work, general silliness, etc. This measure involves a subjective judgment by the teacher but probably reflects some important differences among the children, especially in areas involving social, motivational, and interactional skills. Furthermore, this measure can probably be interpreted in terms of normative expectations because teachers' comments were not coded unless they clearly reflected dissatisfaction with a child's behavior in the classroom. Teachers may not agree exactly where these normative expectations fall on a given scale of behavior. Nevertheless, this measure probably reflects especially the relatively gross deviations from teachers' expectations regarding the role of student.

The results, which are shown in table 13, follow the now familiar pattern. Cell I children did significantly better than cell II children. No significant differences appear among high socioeconomic status children. All three high socioeconomic status groups showed high achievement by this criterion.

Thus, the results of this measure of school achievement again show that the length of the preschool day was related to school achievement among low socioeconomic status children but not among high socioeconomic status groups.

Summary of Results

In this chapter, we have presented the findings on school achievement of six groups of children differentiated by socioeconomic status and preschool attendance. The measures were selected to reflect the children's ability to meet the normative expectations associated with the student role. Two of the measures involve subjective judgment

TABLE 13

TEACHERS' MENTION OF CLASSROOM PROBLEM(S) BY PRESCHOOL GROUP

Mention of Problem	Preschool Group													
	I		II		V		III		IV		VI		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	18	86	54[a]	55	29	72	42	91	219	95	138	93	500	86
Yes	3	14	44	45	11	28	4	9	12	5	10	7	84	14
Total	21	100	98	100	40	100	46	100	231	100	148	100	584	100

[a] χ^2 on groups I and II = 6.9 $p < 01$.

of a child's performance on a number of school related skills. Teacher's comments concerning unacceptable behavior were included only when they referred to non-cognitive skills, so that the importance of social, motivational, and interactional skills could be highlighted in this study of socialization outcomes. The child's promotion pattern is different from teacher's comments because it represents a pooled judgment of several staff members. Also, it reflects differences that are considered important by school officials. When a child is not promoted "as usual," his performance is clearly considered "out of line" with that of his classmates.

On both these measures low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day preschools did significantly better than low socioeconomic status children who had attended short day schools. Further analysis showed that this finding cannot be accounted for by differences in demographic characteristics. On all demographic characteristics where cell I and cell II children differ significantly, statistical analyses were conducted to study the relationship of these demographic characteristics and promotion patterns within the comparison groups. This analysis was limited to promotion patterns because that measure had been chosen as the main criterion variable. This analysis showed no significant relationships between demographic characteristics and school achievement within subgroups.

On both promotion patterns and teachers' comments, there were no significant differences between high socioeconomic status groups of children. Virtually all these children "clearly passed" and very few of these children showed unacceptable school behavior.

The third measure of achievement was a set of two objective tests, one given in kindergarten and one in first grade. This is a much more refined measure of school achievement. Scores may reflect even relatively minor differences in cognitive skills. On these measures the same pattern appeared for the three low socioeconomic groups. Those who had attended long day preschools consistently achieved higher scores than those who had attended short day schools. All high socioeconomic status children did relatively well on these tests. However, children who had attended short day schools did better than those who had attended long day schools. This difference was interpreted as stemming from the more favorable background characteristics of cell IV children. It seemed doubtful that the difference could be due to any educational superiority of short day schools for high socioeconomic status children. The findings on objective tests need to be interpreted with caution because many children had not been tested, especially those who had "not" clearly passed as seen by their promotion patterns.

In summary, these three sets of results offer considerable support for the central hypothesis of this study. Among low socioeconomic status children those who had attended long day preschools consistently did better than children who had attended short day preschools. For low socioeconomic status children long day schools apparently offer training in essential school related skills that short day schools cannot provide. The differences in the socialization process in long and short day schools are reflected in the differences in school achievement of cell I and cell II children.

High socioeconomic status children consistently did better than low socioeconomic status children. On all these measures they performed at least adequately. This finding can be related to the advantage in school related skills that has been attributed to high socioeconomic status children in chapter IV (see proposition 11). Also, this result was to be expected from the well known positive relationship between socioeconomic status and school achievement, noted in chapter III. Differences between high socioeconomic status groups were not as great, on the whole, as differences found among low socioeconomic status groups. They can probably be attributed to noncomparability of the three high socioeconomic status groups with respect to demographic characteristics. Therefore, they do not offer serious counter evidence relating to the major hypothesis of this study. Thus the data on socialization process in the different types of preschools seem to be well supported by the findings from the statistical study on socialization outcomes.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study of preschools and their graduates has been concerned with the relationship between socialization process and socialization outcome. We have focused on the effects of four types of preschools, differentiated along two major dimensions, length of school day and socioeconomic status of client group. Since this has been an exploratory study, it has probably raised more questions than it has been able to answer. This final chapter will begin with a summary of the findings by dealing with the highlights of both the answers and the questions. This will be followed with a brief section on some of the implications of the study and some suggestions for further lines of investigation.

Summary of Findings

One of the basic contributions of this study has been to distinguish between goals and functions of preschool institutions. A traditional assumption in the field of preschool education has been that day care centers (long day schools) were custodial institutions and nursery schools or compensatory education programs (short day schools) were educational institutions. This study has presented data which suggests that long day institutions are as educational in their effects as short day institutions for selected groups of children. As the study progressed, it became clear that the function and the effectiveness of a preschool program depends to a large extent on the specific requirements of the client groups being served.

Accordingly, an attempt was made to relate family socialization process to school achievement among groups of children that differed in the socioeconomic status of their families. From the literature, we noted that a positive correlation had been repeatedly established between socioeconomic status and school achievement. Further, existing studies had called attention to socioeconomic status differences in socialization process. Thus, by focusing on specific school related skills, of the cognitive, social, motivational and interactional variety, we suggested that low socioeconomic status children differed from high socioeconomic status children in their preparation for school work as a result of family socialization. Low socioeconomic status children needed a preschool experience to compensate for school related deficiencies in these skill areas. This was not characteristic of high socioeconomic status children. Therefore, one of the main hypotheses of this study was that preschool attendance would be related to school achievement only among low socioeconomic status children.

However, the major focus of this study has centered on a discussion of the factors that influence the effectiveness of the socialization process within the preschool. A number of propositions were developed to show how long day schools differed from short day schools in aspects that affect the socialization process.

Only a few of these propositions are directly related to the time factor by itself. For instance, we suggested that as a result of the long school day, children in day care centers were exposed to both a greater number and to a greater variety of socialization experiences than children in short day schools.

Most of our propositions involve the effects of time in combination with other characteristics of these institutions. For instance, we suggested that the long school day together with a low staff-client ratio led to a greater emphasis on social skills in day care centers than in short day programs. Specifically, we hypothesized that if time was kept constant, the amount of emphasis on social skills would be inversely related to the staff-student ratio. As a corrolary, if the staff-student ratio is about the same (which fits the case of preschools), the amount of emphasis on social skills would be directly related to the length of the school day.

We also suggested that children attending long day preschools were more effectively socialized because their mothers were more likely to be employed than mothers of children in short day schools. Employed mothers have less time and energy available to exert counterpressures to the socialization process offered by the schools. This line of reasoning raised the question of whether subsidized day care centers would remain as effective if they opened their doors to all low socioeconomic status children instead of restricting their services to those with a "legitimate need."

Presumably, mothers with a "legitimate need" are either working or otherwise unable to care adequately for their children. They would be less likely to exert effective counterpressures than mothers without a "legitimate need" for requesting day care services. In this case, we suggested that preschools that differ with respect to length of day serve a different type of clientele, which, in turn, affects the socialization process and outcome.

A similar kind of reasoning is involved in our analysis of the effects of the teacher-child relationship on the socialization process in different types of preschools. We suggested that children are more dependent on adults in long than in short day schools because teachers in long day schools provide a substitute for maternal care. Teachers in short day schools, on the other hand, offer only a supplemental service. The child's greater dependency in itself increases the effectiveness of the learning process, in long day schools.

However, in addition, teachers in long day schools are more personally committed to the children than teachers in short day schools. Put another way, the teacher-child relationship in long day schools is more socio-emotional whereas in short day schools it is more instrumental. When we combine these two factors we can see that the socialization process in long day schools is more effective because teachers and children form a primary group much like a family. Here again, time is only one among a cluster of factors that affect the socialization process.

However, there are other differences between teachers in long and in short day schools that bear on this point. For instance, most of the teachers in long day schools today are not as highly educated or professionalized as teachers in short day schools. Preschool teachers as an occupational group are eager to climb the professional status ladder. Accordingly, it may be necessary to ask whether teachers in long day schools would continue to maintain a maternal type relationship with the children if they became more professionalized. If not, would this decrease the effectiveness of day care centers in the socialization of children? Is it possible to construct substitute mechanisms which are both compatible with the requirements of professional status and produce similar kinds of beneficial effects for the children?

Finally, we suggested that some of the differences between long and short day schools are primarily the result of historical accidents and not necessarily connected with the length of the preschool day. For instance, we suggested that the socialization process in long day schools might be more effective because the children are usually introduced serially. This means that the socialization process is initiated by the teacher but is reinforced by an ongoing peer group. In short day schools, on the other hand, children are inducted disjunctively, i.e. in large, separate batches. Under such circumstances, the entire socialization process has to be carried out by the teacher alone. With respect to a factor such as this, it may be useful to consider whether the effect of this characteristic could be evaluated in isolation. Then, if it were found to produce an important effect, such a feature could perhaps be incorporated into short day schools as well.

In other words, this study has suggested that a number of different factors may be contributing to the effectiveness of long day preschools as socialization agencies. Only further research can specify which of these are the major variables and whether these factors are directly or only indirectly connected with the length of the preschool day.

By combining our analysis of socioeconomic status differences in family socialization process with our propositions regarding the relative effectiveness of long versus short day preschools, we arrived at the following hypothesis: Low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day preschools would be more likely to meet the normative expectations associated with the student role in elementary school than low socioeconomic status children who had attended short day preschools. Among high socioeconomic status children, those who had attended long day preschools would be expected to do about equally well as those who had attended short day preschools and those who had attended no preschools at all.

This hypothesis was tested through an analysis of the school records of 584 second grade students, who were classified by the type of preschool previously attended. Since a post hoc research design was used, the study is subject to selectivity and mortality as major sources of invalidity. Our discussion dealt at length with the problems of selectivity and concluded that the target groups (low socioeconomic status children who had attended long and short day preschools) were roughly comparable on the main demographic factors, although selectivity on attitudinal variables could not be ruled out. Further, we concluded that mortality probably did not produce an important bias in the result.

One of the problems in this study was that the sample could not be selected according to probability principles. Therefore, the use of statistical tests must be interpreted as only a heuristic device. Certainly the results are not generalizable except in a very general fashion. In order to obtain more definitive data on these questions it would be necessary to replicate this study in other types of communities or to conduct a national study comparable to the Westinghouse Report (Cicarelli, 1969) on the results of Head Start programs.

The central hypothesis was tested by using three independently derived measures of school achievement. The measures were selected to provide an indication of the children's ability to meet the normative requirements of the student role. One measure was the child's ability to achieve normal promotion. Another was the absence of teacher's comments indicating unacceptable classroom behavior. The third was the child's scores on two objective achievement tests, which were scored by an outside agency, and were therefore more independent of teacher's judgments than the other two measures used.

The results on all three measures support the central hypothesis. On each measure of school achievement, low socioeconomic status children who had attended long day preschools did significantly better than low socioeconomic status children who had attended short day preschools. Among high socioeconomic status children few significant differences were found. Almost all the high socioeconomic status children performed adequately. The internal consistency of the results provides stronger support for the central hypothesis than any of the findings in isolation.

In summary, this study has been concerned with the socialization process and outcome of children who attended four types of preschools: long day preschools serving low socioeconomic status children, short day preschools for low socioeconomic status children, long day preschools for high socioeconomic status children and short day preschools for high socioeconomic status children. It was predicted that graduates of long day preschools serving low socioeconomic status children would more adequately meet normative expectations of the primary school than graduates of short day preschools serving low socioeconomic status children. Among graduates of preschools serving high socioeconomic status children, it was predicted that no important differences would be found between those who had attended long and short day preschools. A statistical analysis of three measures of school achievement of children in these four categories showed that the central hypothesis was largely supported by the findings. The results are not directly generalizable but suggest that the length of the preschool day and the socioeconomic status of the client group should be taken into account for an evaluation of preschool programs.

Implications of the Findings

Although many types of implications could be drawn from the results of the study, we will confine this discussion to two that are closely related. First, we will deal with the problem of relevance of programs for the deficiencies of their clientele. Then we will discuss the significance of structural factors as related to socialization settings.

In general, this study provides support for those authors (Hunt, 1964) who have suggested that compensatory programs are most effective when they are structured around the specific deficiencies of their clientele. Bereiter (1966), Deutsch (1967), and Weikart (1967), among others, have all shown that the traditional type programs are relatively ineffective for compensatory education purposes because they are based on study of the middle class child. Throughout this study, we have presented evidence that low socioeconomic status children are significantly different from high socioeconomic status children in their competence in school related skills. For this reason, the long day preschool programs which emphasize a greater variety of learning experiences were found to be more effective for compensatory education than short day programs could hope to be. However, because high socioeconomic status children are adequately prepared for school achievement by the "Hidden Curriculum of the Middle-Class Home" (Strodtbeck, 1967), the socialization process at different types of high socioeconomic status preschools has little relevance for school achievement.

Furthermore, the study has shown the importance of structural factors as determinants of the socialization process. Most investigators in this field have been primarily concerned with program content. Karnes (1969), for instance, has shown the relative effectiveness of five types of programs that differed in their content and teaching techniques. This present study has focused instead on structural factors by showing the unintended consequences of the length of day and other characteristics of long day preschools for the socialization process in preschool settings. As Wheeler (1967) has pointed out, the effect of structural factors on socialization process and outcome has been seriously neglected in sociological research. The present study has attempted to make a contribution in this area.

In this section, we have briefly discussed some of the implications from the findings of this study. We have suggested that the effectiveness of preschool programs depends on the congruence of the services offered with the specific deficiencies of the client group to be served. Therefore, we propose that it is necessary to analyze the clients' capabilities and deficiencies in order to design a program that has maximum benefit for socialization outcome. Furthermore, we have shown that structural factors have an important influence on the effectiveness of socialization. We would suggest that other structural factors than those used in this study may be equally important for socialization process and outcome and should be investigated in the same and other contexts.

Suggestions for Further Investigations

Many possible lines of future research have already been implied in the previous section. However, at this time we would like to suggest that this study may have other implications for the subject of socialization in general and that preschools as a setting for sociological investigation offer some rather unique advantages to the researcher.

Because our concern in this study has been on socialization for school achievement, we have not dealt with the possible effects of the preschool experience on the total socialization of the child. Throughout this investigation, we have called attention to socioeconomic status related differences in values, beliefs, and behavior (Riessman, 1962, Kohn, 1959, 1963). We have suggested that one of the functions of long day schools has been to mold the child into more "middle class-like" patterns of behavior. This effect probably contributes to the child's success in school. However, a child plays other roles than that of student. We do not know the effect of his preschool experience on his ability to function in his family and peer group. Therefore, it might be very useful to investigate the effects of preschool experience on other types of outcomes than that of school achievement. Perhaps the low socioeconomic status child who attended long day schools becomes more alienated from his family and friends than the one who attended short day schools. We have no evidence on this point. In other words, this study of socialization outcome has been strictly limited to a single context, that of the elementary school. Further study is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the socialization experience in other contexts.

Finally, we would like to point out the research advantages of using preschools as a setting for the investigation of sociological questions. First, preschools as a category of institutions, include a very wide range of types. Preschools vary more than primary and secondary schools because a large fraction are still autonomous organizations and privately supported, although an increasing fraction are publicly supported and controlled, like the primary and secondary schools. They probably vary more than institutions of higher learning because licensing standards are more minimal than standards of accreditation applied to colleges. Vast differences between preschools have always been tolerated because the general public has never in the past regarded them as very important. Until the recent upsurge of interest in the young child and the need for compensatory education, children could have been considered one type of so-called "non-persons." Goffman (1951) showed in his study of mental patients that many things could be done for and with such categories of persons that could not be done to "real" people. Therefore, so long as the children were not physically harmed, the schools and centers were permitted a great deal of freedom.

The other advantage in using preschools as a setting is that they offer an outstanding opportunity to observe the socialization process because for most children who attend, this is their first major experience in dealing with an institution outside of the family. The children learn a great deal very rapidly. The socialization process may also be faster in these institutions than in other socialization agencies because the young child is more malleable. One can observe significant changes within the space of a week or a month.

The process by which children learn to adapt to this setting may offer important insight for understanding socialization in other settings. As such, further study of preschool institutions may make important contributions to the body of theory in this field of sociology.

This final section on further implications has suggested that the findings of this study need to be evaluated from a broader perspective than that supplied here. Children have to perform in other areas than in school. Their ability to function in their family and neighborhood also needs to be included in a study of socialization outcomes. The other major point we made was that preschools offer some unique advantages as settings for the study of socialization. They are highly varied in their organization and structure as well as in their goals and functions. Further investigation of the kinds of questions that were involved in this study might offer contributions toward socialization theory as a field of sociology.

This chapter was opened with a very brief summary of the highlights of this study, followed by a section on the implications of the findings and another on suggestions for further investigation. This study represents an attempt to establish connecting links between the structure of socialization settings and socialization outcomes. As such it may contribute to the body of knowledge in sociology.

From a practical standpoint, the results of this study support the optimists who believe that compensatory programs of some kind can help to increase equality of educational opportunity. As such, the results may be of some use for the formulation of policy related to current social issues.

REFERENCES

Becker, H. S. "The Problems of Inference or Proof in Participant Observation," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 23 (December 1958), 652-60.

Becker, H. S. and Geer, B. "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison," *Human Organization*, Vol. 16 (Fall 1957), 28-32.

Beilin, H. and Gotkin, L. G. "Psychological Issues in the Development of Mathematics Curricula for Socially Disadvantaged Children" in *Education of the Disadvantaged: A Book of Readings*. Edited by Passow, H., Goldberg, M., and Tannenbaum, A. J. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Bereiter, C. *Acceleration of Intellectual Development in Early Childhood: Final Report*, ERIC No. ED014332, 1967.

Bereiter, C. and Engelman, S. *Teaching Disadvantaged Children in Preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Bernstein, B. "Language and Social Class," *British Journal of Sociology*, 11, 1960.

Blau, P. M. and Scott, W. R. *Formal Organizations*. Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Blau, P. M. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Bidwell, C. E. "The School as a Formal Organization" in *Handbook of Organizations*, Marsh, J. G. (ed.), Rand McNally, 1965.

Bidwell, C. E. "Pre-Adult Socialization," a paper presented at the Social Science Research Conference on Socialization and Social Structure, May, 1962.

Brim, O. G. "Personality Development as Role-Learning" in *Personality Development in Children*, ed. by Iscoe, I. and Stevenson, H. W., Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.

Brim, O. G. "Socialization Through the Life Cycle" in *Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays*, John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Caldwell, B. M. *The Preschool Inventory: Technical Report*, Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967.

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Canter, S. and Feder, B. "Psychological Consultation in Head Start Programs," *American Psychologist*, 23, No. 8, (August 1968).

Caplow, T. *The Sociology of Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Carlson, R. O. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," *National Society for the Study of Education*, Part 2, 1964.

Charters, W. W. "Social Class Analysis and the Control of Public Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 23, (Fall 1953).

Cicarelli, V. *et al*. *The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development*, Volumes I and II, Distributed by Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, U.S. Department of Commerce/National Bureau of Standards, June 12, 1969.

Cicourel, A. V. and Kitsuse, J. I. *The Educational Decision Makers*. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1963.

Clark, B. *The Open Door College: A Case Study*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

Clark, B. R. "Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Values" in *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, ed. by Etzioni, A., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Deutsch, C. P. "Auditory Discrimination and Learning: Social Factors," in Deutsch, M., *The Disadvantaged Child: Studies of the Social Environment and the Learning Process*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Deutsch, M. "The Role of Social Class in Language Development" in *Education of the Disadvantaged: A Book of Readings*. Edited by Passow, A. H., Goldberg, M., and Tannenbaum, A. J. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Deutsch, M. *Minority Group and Class Status as Related to Social and Personality Factors in Scholastic Achievement*, Monograph #2, Published by the Society for Applied Anthropology, 1960.

Deutsch, M. and Brown, B. "Social Influences in Negro-White Intelligence Differences," *Journal of Social Issues*, 20, 1964.

Deutsch, M. *et al*. *The Disadvantaged Child: Studies of the Social Environment and the Learning Process*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Farber, B. Mental Retardation. *Its Social Context and Social Consequences*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Fisher, D. F. The Montessori Manual for Teachers and Parents. Cambridge, Mass.: R. Bentley, 1964.

Folger, J. K. and Nam, C. B. Education of the American People: A 1960 Census Monograph, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1967.

Fowler, W. "The Effect of Early Stimulation in the Emergence of Cognitive Processes" in Early Education, ed. by Hess, R. D. and Baer, R. M., The Committee on Learning and the Educational Process, Social Science Research Council, 1968.

Fuller, M. "Early Childhood Education," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1960.

Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Goffman, E. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates. Anchor Books, 1961.

Gracey, H. S. "Learning the Student Role: Kindergarten as Academic Bootcamp" in Readings in Introductory Sociology, Wrong, D. H. and Gracey, H. L. (eds.) New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967.

Grambs, J. D. Schools, Scholars, and Society, Foundations of Education Series, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Gray, S. W. and Klaus, R. A. "The Early Training Project and Its General Rationale" in Early Education: Current Theory, Research and Practice, ed. by Hess, R. D. and Baer, R. M. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

Gross, N. "The Sociology of Education" in Sociology Today, Merton, R. K., Broom, L., and Cottrell, L. S., Jr. (eds.). New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Hall, E. The Silent Language. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1959.

Handbook of Cooperative Primary Tests, Educational Testing Service, Cooperative Test Division, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967.

Hansen, D. A. and Gerstl, J. E. (eds.). On Education-Sociological Perspectives. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Hess, R. D. and Shipman, V. C. "Maternal Influence Upon Early Training: The Cognitive Environments of Urban Pre-School Children," in Early Education, Hess, R. D. and Baer, R. M. (eds.), The Committee on Learning and the Educational Process, Social Science Research Council, 1968.

Hunt, J. Mcv. "Has Compensatory Education Failed? Has It Been Attempted?" *Harvard Educational Review*, *39*, No. 2 (Spring, 1970).

Jensen, A. R. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review*, *38*, No. 1 (Winter 1969).

Jones, E. "Nursery School Teachers in California," *Journal of Nursery Education*, 19, No. 1, 1963.

Karnes, M. B., Hodgins, A. S. and Teska, J. A. "The Effects of Five Pre-School Interventions: Evaluations Over Two Years," in *Research and Development Programs on Preschool Disadvantaged Children*, Karnes, M. B., project director, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, 1969.

Karnes, M. B. *et al*. "An Evaluation of Two Preschool Programs for Disadvantaged Children: A Traditional and a Highly Structured Experimental Preschool," *Exceptional Children*, *34* (May 1968).

Katz, L. G. "Sentimentality in Preschool Teachers: Some Possible Interpretations" (Paper presented at American Education Research Association, March, 1970).

Kitano, H. H. *The Child Care Center: A Study of the Interaction Among One-Parent Children, Parents, and School*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1963.

Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation," *American Journal of Sociology*, *68*, 1963.

Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and Parental Values," *American Journal of Sociology*, *64*, 1959.

Kuhn, T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Lamb, H. *et al*. "The Development of Self-Other Relationships During Project Head Start," ERIC #ED015008, 1965.

Lenrow, P. B. "Preschool Socialization and the Development of Competence: An Exploratory Research Project," *Project Evaluation*, March 1, 1968.

Lieberman, M. *Education as a Profession*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Lipset, S. M. *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. Anchor Books, 1963.

Mason, W. S. Dressel, R. J. and Bain, R. K. "Sex Role and Career Orientations of Beginning Teachers," Harvard Educational Review, 29, (Fall 1959).

Merton, R. K. "Manifest and Latent Functions" in Social Theory and Social Structure, The Free Press, 1957.

Montessori, M., et al. The Montessori Method. New York: Schoken Books, 1964.

Parsons, T. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations" in Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader, Etzioni, A. (ed.), Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Parsons, T. "The School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society," Harvard Educational Review, 29 (Fall, 1959).

Parsons, T. The Social System. The Free Press, 1951.

Prescott, E., and Jones, E. Group Day Care as a Child Rearing Environment. Report to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.

Prescott, E. A Pilot Study of Day Care Centers and Their Clientele. Report to the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1965.

Prodipto, R. "Maternal Employment and Adolescent Roles: Rural-Urban Differentials," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 23 (Nov. 1961).

Rambush, N. M. Learning How to Learn; An American Approach to Montessori; A Montessori Bibliography of Materials in the English Language, 1909-1961. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1962.

Reissman, F. The Culturally Deprived Child. Harper and Row, 1962.

Report on Day Care, Child Welfare Report No. 14, U.S. Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1964.

Riessman, D. "Teachers Amid Changing Expectations," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 24, No. 2, (Spring 1954).

Riley, C., and Epps, M. J. Head Start in Action. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., 1967.

Rosen, B. "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification," American Sociological Review, 21, 1956.

Scott, W. R. "Field Methods in the Study of Organizations," in Handbook of Organizations, March, J. G. (ed.). Rand McNally, 1965.

Selznick, P. "Foundations of the Theory of Organizations" in *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, ed. by Etzioni, A., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Selznick, P. *Leadership in Administration*. Harper and Row, 1957.

Sexton, P. C. *Education and Income: Inequality of Opportunity in the Public Schools*. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Shils, E. A. "The Calling of Sociology" in *Theories of Society*, Parsons, T. *et al*. (eds.), Vol. 2, The Free Press, 1965.

Sorokin, P. *Social Mobility*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1927.

Stinchcombe, A. L. *Constructing Social Theories*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1968.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R., Ehrlich, D., and Sabshin, M. *Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions*. The Free Press, 1964.

Street, D. "Educators and Social Workers: Sibling Rivalry in the Inner City," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 41, No. 2, (June 1967).

Strodtbeck, F. L. "The Hidden Curriculum of the Middle-Class Home" in *Education of the Disadvantaged: A Book of Readings* ed. by Passow, H., Goldberg, M., and Tannenbaum, A. J. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Swift, J. "Effects of Early Group Experience: The Nursery School and the Day Care Nursery," in *Review of Child Development Research*, Vol. I, Hoffman, M. and Hoffman, L. W. (eds.). New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Sykes, G. M. *The Society of Captives*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Taylor, K. W. *Parent Cooperative Nursery Schools*. Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1954.

Toby, J. "Orientation to Education as a Factor in the School Maladjustment of Lower Class Children," *Social Forces*, *35*, 1957.

Waller, S. *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965 (first editions published in 1932).

Weikart, D. P. "Results of Preschool Intervention Programs," in *Preschool Intervention: A Preliminary Report of the Perry Preschool Project*, Weikart, D. P. (ed.), Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1967.

Wheeler, S. "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," in *Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays*, by Brim, O. G. and Wheeler, S. John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Whiting, J. W. M. "Resource Mediation and Learning by Identification," in *Personality Development in Children*, ed. by Iscoe, I. and Stevenson, H. W. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.

Wolff, M. and Stein, A. *Factors Influencing Recruitment of Children into the Head Start Program*, Summer, 1965. ERIC # ED015026.

Wolff, M. and Stein, A. "Long Range Effect of Pre-Schooling on Reading Achievement," Study III, August, 1966, ERIC # ED015027.

Wylie, R. C. *The Self Concept: A Critical Survey of Pertinent Research Literature*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Zeaman, D. and House, B. J. "The Role of Attention in Retardate Discrimination Learning," in *Handbook of Mental Deficiency: Psychological Theory and Research*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRESCHOOL TEACHERS

This form was originally designed to serve as a mailed questionnaire. Therefore, it addresses the respondent personally and the instructions are such that she can complete it without help from an interviewer. In the study as it was finally carried out, the questionnaire was used as a starting point for much more extensive and intensive information gathering on the role of the preschool teacher.

Section I. Your School or Day Care Center

1. Is your school privately owned and operated? Yes____No____

2. Is your class(es) part of the local public school system? Yes____No____

3. Is it a Head Start Program? Yes____No____

4. Is your school or center sponsored by:
   a church? Yes____No____
   a United Fund (Red Feather)? Yes____No____
   a parent cooperative? Yes____No____
   a poverty program? Yes____No____
   OTHER (Explain)____

5. Including yourself, how many people work in your school or center:
   full time? _______
   part time? _______

6. What is your position or title?______________________________

7. What are the positions or titles of other staff members in your school, e.g. assistant teacher, cook, head teacher, principal, janitor, etc. Please list them below.

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

8. How many children are presently enrolled in your school? (If you are working in a local public school, give only the number that are enrolled in the preschool program.)

9. Put a check next to the statement that best answers the following question: What is the length of the school day for most of the preschool age children in your school or center?
   ( ) 8 hours or more
   ( ) 5-7 hours
   ( ) 3-4 hours
   ( ) less than 3 hours.

10. What is your tuition (fees paid by parents)?____________________

    Do some families pay less? Yes____No____

    What is the smallest amount that any child is paying right now?
    ____

11. Are the children divided into seperate classes? Yes____ No____

If you answered Yes, how many classes are there? __________

12. Check the best answer. About what proportion of your children come from:

	All	Most	About Half	A Few	None
Underprivileged homes?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
One Parent Homes?	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Homes with Working Mothers	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

13. Below is a list of five goals of preschool teachers. Put a (1) next to the one that you consider most important, a (2) next to the one that you think ranks next in importance and so on. Then put next to OTHER any goals that you think should have been included in the list.

( ) Give the children basic information, e.g. alphabet, numbers, etc.
( ) Give the children discipline or training so that they will know how to behave when they get to school.
( ) Give the children good care and protection.
( ) Find out about and help the children with emotional or other personal problems.
( ) Stimulate the children's native creativity or curiosity.

OTHER____

14. Place a check next to the best answer(s) to the following question. Then write any answers not included in the list after OTHER.

What are the main reasons that parents send their children to your school or center?
( ) Parent is working and/or studying.
( ) Parent wants enrichment for his children.
( ) Parent wants the children out of the house for a while.
( ) Everyone else is sending their children.
( ) Parent wants children to be with other children.
( ) The program is compulsory.

OTHER____

15. Check the item(s) that correctly answers the following question. Then write in any item(s) not included after OTHER.
What form(s) of contact do you have with parents?
( ) Attend and/or take part in group parent meetings.
( ) Conduct individual conferences with parents.
( ) Talk with parents briefly when they bring and fetch children.

OTHER____

16. Below is a list of 4 possible goals that teachers have for parents of the children they teach. Rank them from (1) to (4) in order of their importance. The most important goal should be given a (1). Then add next to OTHER any goals that you think should have been included.
    (   ) Get parents to cooperate by following the school's regulations, e.g. paying fees on time, bringing extra clothing, etc.
    (   ) Educate parents in the principles of child development and in how to handle their own children.
    (   ) Stimulate parents to take greater interest in their own children.
    (   ) Get parents to relax and take pressure off their own children.

    OTHER____

Section II. Your Background

17. Check the best answer to the following question.

    How long have you been a preschool teacher?
    (   ) Less than one year.
    (   ) 1-2 years.
    (   ) 3-5 years.
    (   ) 6 years or more.

18. Briefly describe how you happened to get into this line of work.
    ____
    ____
    ____

19. Have you taught other age children or adults? Yes____No____

    If Yes, what ages did you teach?____________________

    For about how many years?____________________

20. What were some of the other types of work that you have done, if any?
    ____
    ____
    ____

21. Did you finish high school? Yes____No____

    If Yes, what year did you finish?______

22. Did you finish college? Yes____No____
    If No, did you ever attend college? Yes____No____
    If Yes, what year did you last attend college?_______
    If Yes, what you did you finish?________
    What was your major field?____________________

23. Did you finish a graduate degree? Yes____No____

If No, did you ever take graduate courses? Yes____No____

If Yes, what year did you last take graduate courses?______
What was your major field?______________________________

If Yes, (If you finished a graduate degree)
What degree was it?_______________
What year did you finish?__________
What was your major field?____________________

24. Did you ever take any education courses at a college? Yes___No____

If Yes, check the statement below that best fits how useful you found them for your current work.
( ) Very useful
( ) Somewhat useful
( ) Of little value
( ) A complete waste of time

25. Education courses at college can roughly be divided into three types, theory courses, subject matter or practical courses, and field work. If you have ever taken any of these types, place a check to indicate how useful you found them for your current work.

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Of Little Value	A Waste of Time
Theory Courses	( )	( )	( )	( )
Subject Courses	( )	( )	( )	( )
Field Work	( )	( )	( )	( )

26. Have you ever attended any workshops for preschool teachers?
Yes____No____

If Yes, check the answer below that best fits how useful you found it for your current work.
( ) Very useful
( ) Somewhat useful
( ) Of little value
( ) A waste of time

27. Below is a list of some groups of people. Place a check next to those that you think have an important influence over what you do as a teacher. Add any groups not included after OTHER.
( ) The professional superiors in your school, e.g. director, principal, head teachers, etc.
( ) The staff of the licensing or accrediting agency.
( ) The board of your organization.
( ) The parents of the children you teach.
OTHER____

28. Check the statement below that best describes the amount of freedom you feel you have in your work.
    ( ) I have complete freedom except for minor school and/or state regulations.
    ( ) I have to follow various rules and regulations that occasionally interfere with what I want to do.
    ( ) I am often hindered from doing as I would like by rules, required use of teaching materials, etc.
    ( ) I have very little freedom to carry out my work as I would like.

29. Many people form an opinion of your work as a teacher. From the list of groups below check the one(s) whose opinion of yourself you value most highly. Add any groups not included after OTHER
    ( ) The superiors in your organization, e.g. director, etc.
    ( ) The staff of the licensing or accrediting agency.
    ( ) Your fellow teachers.
    ( ) The children you teach.
    ( ) The parents of the children you teach.
    OTHER______________________________
    Which of those you checked would you put in first place?
    ____

Section III. Your Occupation

30. What do you think best distinguishes a professional from a non-professional person?______________________________

31. Do you think that preschool teachers in general are as professional as doctors or lawyers? Yes____No____
    Please explain______________________________
    ____

32. Check the answer that best fits the way you would describe yourself.
    ( ) I am fully professional.
    ( ) I am semi-professional.
    ( ) I am not professional.
    Please explain______________________________
    ____

33. Below is a list of some other occupational groups. Check the one that you think is most like preschool teachers. Then add after OTHER groups that you think are most like preschool teachers than those mentioned.

    ( ) Elementary school teachers
    ( ) Baby sitters or other mother substitues
    ( ) Clinical psychologists (therapists)

    Other______________________________

34. As a preschool teachers, which of the two groups listed below do you think you benefit the most? Check the best answer and add any others that you think should be included after OTHER

( ) The children you teach.
( ) The parents of the children you teach.
OTHER____

35. Of the two statements below, check the one that you think is a better description of preschool teaching.

( ) It is a science because its principles can be learned by any intelligent person.
( ) It is an art because it depends primarily on a person's native ability.

36. Are you a member of any professional organization? Yes____No____

If Yes, about how many?________

37. Do you see regularly any professional journals, magazines, or other literature? Yes____No____

If Yes, please list:
( ) 1.______________________________________
( ) 2.______________________________________
( ) 3.______________________________________
( ) 4.______________________________________
( ) 5.______________________________________

Now put next to each item in your list, in the space enclosed in the parentheses, the letter of the statement (of those listed below) that best describes how much of it you read.

(a) I read an occasional item here or there.
(b) I read less than half.
(c) I read about half.
(d) I read most of it.
(e) I read it from cover to cover.
(f) I don't read any of it.

38. Check the statement that best describes the amount of contact that you have with other preschool teachers, outside of work.

( ) I seldom see other preschool teachers.
( ) I see them occasionally.
( ) I see them quite often.
( ) I see them all the time.

39. Are there any preschool teachers among your good friends?
Yes____No____

40. Check the statement that best describes how often you discuss problems connected with your work with other preschool teachers.

( ) I never discuss such problems with them.
( ) I occasionally discuss such problems with them.
( ) I often discuss such problems with them.

41. What kinds of children give a preschool teacher the most trouble?

What do you do about it when you have such children?

42. What kinds of parents give a preschool teacher the most trouble?

What do you do about it when you have such parents?

43. Do parents ever try to tell you how to do your job? Yes____No____

If Yes, what do you do when this happens?

44. What generally happens when you and a parent disagree?

45. Who do you go to for help when you run into a difficult problem on the job?

46. What do you expect to be doing five years from now?

47. If you had complete freedom to choose, what kind of a job or position would you most like to have some day?

48. Under what circumstances, if any, would you stop being preschool teacher?

49. What do you like best about being a preschool teacher?

50. What do you like least about being a preschool teacher?__________
____

Section IV. General Background Information

51. Check your sex. Male____Female____.

52. Check your marital status.
    - (   ) Single
    - (   ) Married
    - (   ) Divorced or Seperated
    - (   ) Widowed

53. Do you have children of your own? Yes____No____

54. Check the category that best fits your age.
    - (   ) Under 25
    - (   ) 25-29
    - (   ) 30-34
    - (   ) 35-39
    - (   ) 40-44
    - (   ) 45-49
    - (   ) 50-54
    - (   ) 55-59
    - (   ) 60-64
    - (   ) Over 65.

55. Check the category that best fits your salary or income from your work.
    - (   ) Less than $2,000
    - (   ) $2,000-2,999
    - (   ) $3,000-3,999
    - (   ) $4,000-4,999
    - (   ) $5,000-5,999
    - (   ) $6,000-6,999
    - (   ) $7,000-7,999
    - (   ) $8,000-8,999
    - (   ) $9,000-9,999
    - (   ) $10,000-10,999
    - (   ) $11,000-11,999
    - (   ) $12,000 or more

APPENDIX B

SHORT FORM DESIGNED FOR DATA COLLECTION

SCHOOL DISTRICT No. Superintendent of Schools

MEMORANDUM

To: Principals

From: (Assistant to the Superintendent)

Re: Pupil Information

In connection with a study which is being conducted, please supply me with the information requested for the child whose name and ID number are listed below.

Name: ID Number:

Address: Sex-Race Code:

Birthdate:

Where was child born:

At what grade level is child functioning:

Occupation of Parents:

Mother: Father:

Who does child live with:

Number of siblings:

Preschool experience;

Name of school: Where

How long attended:

Caldwell Inventory Results: Date:

Coop. Listening Results:

Number of half days absent last year:

Teacher's comments regarding problems that interfere with learning:

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL TABLES

TABLE 14

WITHIN GROUPS I AND II FAMILY STRUCTURE BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)

Family Structure	Group 1						Group II					
	Clear Pass		Not		Total		Clear Pass		Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Both Parents	8	73	3	27	11	100	27	55	22	49	49	100
Mother Only[a]	4	100	0	0	4	100	7	28	18	72	25	100
Father Only[b]	0	0	1	100	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Remainder[c]	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	43	4	57	7	100

[a] Includes cases of mother with another man, e.g. stepfather, grandfather.

[b] Includes cases of father with another woman, e.g. stepmother, grandmother.

[c] Includes cases of other relatives or guardians.

TABLE 15

WITHIN GROUPS I AND II OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF FATHER BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)

Occupational Status of Father	Group I						Group II					
	Clear Pass		Not		Total		Clear Pass		Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	5	100
Medium	1	33	2	67	3	100	4	36	7	64	11	100
Low	7	78	2	22	9	100	20	56	16	44	36	100
Out of Home	4	100	0	0	4	100	7	28	18	72	25	100
Remainder[a]	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	3	75	4	100

[a] Includes those that cannot be classified as well as those unemployed.

TABLE 16

WITHIN GROUPS I AND II SEX AND RACE BY PROMOTION PATTERN (ELIMINATING UNGRADED)

Sex and Race	Group I						Group II					
	Clear Pass		Not		Total		Clear Pass		Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Boys White	3	100	0	0	3	100	4	50	4	50	8	100
Boys Black	3	50	3	50	6	100	10	29	24	71	34	100
Girls White	2	100	0	0	2	100	4	100	0	0	4	100
Girls Black	4	80	1	20	5	100	19	54	16	46	35	100

VITA

Ellen Oppenheimer Handler

Personal Background Information

Birth Date: July 2, 1929

Place of Birth: Berlin, Germany

Marital Status: Married

Children: Three children, ages 8, 12, 14

Education

Vassar College, 1947-1951; Received B.A. degree 1951; Major Field: Sociology

School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, 1951-1953; Received M.A. degree, 1953.

University of Illinois, Department of Sociology, 1965 to present.

Honors and Awards

Phi Beta Kappa, Vassar College, 1950

Vassar Graduate Fellowship, 1951-1952

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis Fellowship, 1952-1953.

Danforth Graduate Fellowship for Women, 1965 to present.

Employment History

Research Associate, Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work, University of Illinois, 1962-1965.

Research Analyst, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, 1956.

Medical Social Worker, University of Chicago Clinics, 1953-1954.

Medical Social Worker, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Illinois, Summer, 1952.

Publication

Collaborated on Report to Children's Bureau
Grant D-52 (R) (C2)

The Training of Personnel for the Licensing of Family Homes in Child Welfare